

Also, a bill (H. R. 20515) granting an increase of pension to Theodore A. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20516) for the relief of C. G. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 20517) granting an increase of pension to William H. Hatfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKELLAR: A bill (H. R. 20518) granting an increase of pension to L. M. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20519) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20520) for the relief of the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory*; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 20521) granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Atherton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 20522) granting a pension to Bert Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 20523) granting a pension to Cleveland Shive; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WATSON: A bill (H. R. 20524) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Premer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Resolutions adopted by the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Taylor Lodge, No. 175, Newark, Ohio, favoring the passage of H. R. 17894 and S. 6165, to extend the boiler-inspection law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., relative to export of arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Liberal Immigration League, relative to suspension of head tax on immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Brooklyn Diocesan Branch of the American Federation of Catholic Societies and St. Vincent de Paul's Lyceum, all of New York, protesting against the use of the mails by the Menace; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DRUKKER: Petition of citizens of New Jersey, favoring House joint resolution 377, relative to export of munitions of war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of T. C. Beckwith, Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Netti E. Bauer, of Providence, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Protests of the Hartford Business Men's Association, Hartford, Conn.; the New Departure Manufacturing Co., Bristol, Conn.; the Hartford Special Machinery Co., Hartford, Conn.; and Mr. Forrest Morgan, Hartford, Conn., relative to export trade; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, protest of F. C. Monier, jr., of New Britain, Conn., relative to the exportation of firearms and ammunition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McKELLAR: Papers to accompany bill granting relief to the owners of the steamboat *W. B. Savory*; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany a bill for relief of the estate of Jacob Joyner, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for increase of pension to L. M. Jarvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHAN: Memorial of Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against the passage of any legislation that will interfere with the exportation of the products of the United States to any country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of C. F. Kesting, J. C. Schmeds, B. H. Sanger, and H. Juse, of Los Molinos, Cal., favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Pilot Hill (Cal.) Local Socialist Lodge, favoring prohibition of exportation of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Luis Obispo (Cal.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Fred Miller, Redding, Cal., favoring repeal of that section of Constitution of the United States which reads: "The Congress shall have power to borrow money on the credit of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED: Petition of 252 merchants of the first New Hampshire congressional district, favoring the passage of H. R. 5308; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Memorial of Hebrews of Meriden, Conn., relative to literacy test in the Smith immigration bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Hartford (Conn.) Business Men's Association, protesting against law prohibiting exportation of the products of the United States to any other country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 4, 1915.

The Senate met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thy guidance and blessing as we start upon the uncharted paths of a new year. We recognize Thy goodness to us in all the providences that have surrounded us in the year that has gone, and we seek Thy favor that we may follow the light that shines upon the path of the just more and more unto the perfect day. We praise Thee for peace within all our boundaries, and for the high spirit of brotherhood that animates those who are the leaders of the people. We pray that Thy grace may be upon Thy servants in this Senate, that they may have the spirit of Christian statesmen, and that they may be witnesses for God for peace unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Hear us in our prayer; accept the praises of Thy people for Thy goodness; and guide us on in the fulfillment of Thine own divine plan for us as a Nation. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Tuesday, December 29, 1914.

Mr. SWANSON. I ask that the further reading of the Journal may be dispensed with.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to hear it read this morning.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah object?

Mr. SMOOT. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Utah objects, and the Secretary will read the Journal.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the credentials of WESLEY L. JONES, chosen by the electors of the State of Washington a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1915, which were read and ordered to be filed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. KENYON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Dodge, Schleswig, and Dubuque, all in the State of Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pleasant Valley, Kans., and a petition of the members of the ladies' classes of the Methodist Sunday School of Lúray, Kans., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I have received a number of communications from citizens of the State of North Dakota urging the passage of legislation at the present session of Congress prohibiting the sale of munitions of war to the belligerent nations of Europe. I ask that the communications may be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, in connection with what the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CRAWFORD] has just said, I wish to state that I have also received hundreds of individual letters and many petitions on the same subject, in reference to Senate 6688, the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I do not feel like presenting all the letters and having them printed in the RECORD, but I simply call the attention of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the Senate to the fact that I have received several hundred letters

upon the subject. It seems that the citizens of my State are deeply interested in the bill, and I hope and know that the committee will give it due consideration and take such action as they may deem proper.

Mr. ROOT presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Minnesota Peace Society, of St. Paul, Minn., remonstrating against an increase in the armament of this country, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Minnesota, praying for the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Minnesota, remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented a paper to accompany the bill (S. 7063) granting an increase of pension to Caro H. Moore, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DILLINGHAM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Jamaica, Vt., remonstrating against the exclusion of anti-Catholic publications from the mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. WEEKS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Washington, D. C.; Kansas City, Mo.; Boswell, Ind.; Chicago, Ill.; and Jamestown, Ohio, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Whitman, New Bedford, Lowell, Boston, Dorchester, Hardner, Charlestown, Cambridge, Everett, and Athol, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEE of Maryland presented a petition of sundry citizens of Browningsville, Md., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of John Crote and 150 other citizens of Rockville, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the exportation of ammunition, etc., which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey presented a petition of the Society of Friends of Woodbury, N. J., commending the President's efforts toward bringing about peace in Europe, and remonstrating against increased armament in this country, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition adopted by the Fruit Growers' Convention, held at Los Angeles, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the inspection of all horticultural products at certain points of entry into any State, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Eureka, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide pensions for civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

He also presented a petition of the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, of San Francisco, Cal., praying for an appropriation for the purchase of a wire dragnet for southeastern Alaska and also for the construction of a lighthouse tender, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHIVELY presented a petition of Frank Britton Camp, No. 16, United Spanish War Veterans, of Crawfordville, Ind., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to widows and orphans of Spanish War veterans, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of Local Division No. 598, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Richmond; of Local Division No. 154, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Evansville; of Local Division No. 606, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Michigan City; of Local Division No. 12, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Fort Wayne; of Local Lodge No. 136, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Fort Wayne; of Local Division No. 520, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Gary; and of the Wabash Railway Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Peru, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the extension of the boiler-inspection laws, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of Aerie No. 248, Fraternal Order of Eagles, of Fort Wayne, Ind., remonstrating against national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of the Rush Creek Friends Bible School, of Kingman; of the Sunday school of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, of Fort Wayne; of L. M. Kreder, George W. Cate, J. C. Olwin, and 47 other residents of Greentown; of Whitewater Friends Church, of Richmond, all in the State of Indiana, praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented a petition of 24 citizens of Aberdeen, Wash., and a petition of Lake Union Lodge, No. 116, International Order of Good Templars, of Seattle, Wash., praying for national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 6919) to authorize aids to navigation and other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 851) thereon.

DELAWARE RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 6839) extending the time for completion of the bridge across the Delaware River authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. and the Pennsylvania & Newark Railroad Co., or their successors, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Delaware River," approved the 24th day of August, 1912, and I submit a report (No. 849) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] to the report.

Mr. OLIVER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROCK RIVER BRIDGE, ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I report back favorably without amendment from the Committee on Commerce the bill (S. 6776) granting an extension of time to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Colona Ferry, in the State of Illinois, and I submit a report (No. 850) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAFETY OF LIFE AT SEA.

Mr. FLETCHER. By direction of the Committee on Commerce I report back the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 136) to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea, with the recommendation that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be five in number, and to be appointed by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the action suggested by the Committee on Commerce will be taken. The Chair hears none. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. VARDAMAN, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 7124) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate two condemned bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces and a suitable outfit of cannon balls to the city of Morganton, N. C.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 7125) granting a pension to Robert H. Trollinger; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRADY:

A bill (S. 7126) authorizing the submission to the Court of Claims of the claim of Albert J. Hewlett, of Pocatello, Idaho, for damages sustained by reason of the overflow of his lands in connection with the Government canal being constructed under the supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Interior Department; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 7127) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Ludiker (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7128) granting an increase of pension to Jerome B. Wright (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7129) granting a pension to Andrew J. Herring (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DILLINGHAM:

A bill (S. 7130) granting a pension to Celia A. Blodgett (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7131) granting a pension to Esther Phillips (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 7132) to amend an act entitled "An act to repeal section 3480 of the Revised Statutes of the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 7133) granting an increase of pension to H. B. Crouch;

A bill (S. 7134) granting an increase of pension to Robert Conn; and

A bill (S. 7135) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Crawford; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Arizona:

A bill (S. 7136) for the purchase of a site for a public building at Bisbee, Cochise County, Ariz.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7137) granting an increase of pension to George L. Neal (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 7138) granting an increase of pension to Fernando Miller (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE:

A bill (S. 7139) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Raphale; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WORKS:

A bill (S. 7140) creating an additional land district in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7141) for the relief of C. G. Wilford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 7142) granting an increase of pension to John Sargent (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 7143) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Gwin (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7144) granting an increase of pension to John P. Simpson (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7145) granting a pension to Charles M. Preston (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7146) granting an increase of pension to Albert Baur; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 7147) to amend section 4215 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WORKS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 218) to provide for the detail of an officer of the Army for duty with the Panama-California Exposition, San Diego, Cal.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. STONE. I submit two proposed amendments to Senate bill 6856, known as the shipping bill, which I ask may be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is now on the calendar. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table, to be taken up in connection with the consideration of that bill. However, if the Senator from Missouri makes a motion that they go to the Committee on Commerce, the Chair will submit it to the Senate.

Mr. STONE. For the present let them lie on the table. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be the order.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,000 to pay Tom K. Richie, of Tucson, Ariz., the amount having been inadvertently covered into the Treasury on a forfeited cash recognizance, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill, which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LANE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$200,000 due the estates of deceased colored soldiers, sailors, and marines of the Civil War, to be used for the erection of a national home for aged and infirm colored people in the District of Columbia, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19906), which was ordered to be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LANE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill (H. R. 20189), which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

OMNIBUS CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 8846), which were referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

SHIPMENT OF NAVAL STORES ABROAD.

Mr. HARDWICK. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 512), as follows:

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest, to transmit to the Senate copies of all communications transmitted to or received from the Government of Great Britain touching the recent order of said Government declaring naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products absolute contraband of war, and the previous order of said Government declaring that the products above enumerated were not contraband of war.

Also copies of any other communications transmitted to or received from any foreign Government in reference to the classification of naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products as contraband of war.

Also copies of any communications transmitted to or received from any foreign Government relating to the detention of ships under American registry carrying cargoes of naval stores, turpentine, rosin, and resinous products.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read. Is there objection?

Mr. STONE. I ask that the resolution go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri objects. Under the rule, the resolution will lie over one day and be printed.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I move that the bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, which passed the Senate on Saturday last, may be printed showing the amendments of the Senate numbered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, it will be so ordered. The Chair hears none.

SALE AND SHIPMENT OF COTTON.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, some days since I had inserted in the RECORD certain communications from European cotton buyers and spinners in answer to questions propounded by me relative to the outlook for the cotton trade situation. I have to-day a translation of a letter received from C. A. Gruner & Co., of Bremen, Germany, which I send to the desk. I ask that it be read by the Secretary and that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the letter was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

BREMEN, November 20, 1914.

E. D. SMITH, Esq.,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C., United States of America:

We take the liberty to answer your kind letter of September 29 in German, as the regulations now in force do not permit correspondence in English.

In answer to the questions asked, we will reply briefly as follows:

1. The consumption of American cotton in Germany and Austria is entirely dependent on the possibility or impossibility of regulated cotton importation. If the possibility of importing cotton were assured, the consumption would certainly be at least normal, and probably even heavier than usual, as East Indian and Egyptian cotton, the consumption of which is large in Germany and Austria, could be replaced by American cotton.

2. The question as to the size of the stock on hand we are not permitted to answer, for reasons easily understood.

3. Since the middle of September work has been going on in full force almost everywhere in the German spinning industry, with an increasing demand.

4. Should the war last very much longer a reduction in operations could only be avoided if the supply of cotton could be directly or indirectly guaranteed.

5. Funds for the purchase of cotton are plentiful in Germany, the increase in the rate of exchange brought about by the war not figuring in the equation.

6. As traffic in German and English vessels to Germany seems to be precluded, we are dependent upon neutral bottoms for our imports, therefore first of all upon American and Scandinavian ships. Unfortunately the space available from this source is small, and unless the United States make great exertions to place all in anywise available ships into the freight traffic the prospects for a considerable exchange of commodities between our country and yours are none too bright.

7. Our industry still has an adequate number of working hands at its disposal, especially as the spinning and weaving business is capable of greatly extending the amount of its female labor.

8-9. As said before, everything depends upon shipping facilities. The consumption of American cotton in Germany might be splendid if only certainty of importation could be secured. Every bit of cotton that can be landed in Germany would be willingly taken. The United States therefore have a strong incentive to make every effort in studying the question of transportation and in devising ways and means of promoting and assisting a sure exportation service to Europe. The success of such endeavors would necessarily mean a brilliant business for America.

THOMAS JEFFERSON AS ARCHITECT.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have had sent me a copy of the Architectural Quarterly, of Harvard University, which contains an article which presents Thomas Jefferson, to me at least, and I think to the mass of our fellow citizens, in an entirely new light. We know him as a man of letters and as a broad statesman, but this demonstrates the fact that he was an architect of exceeding merit. It seems to me that it would be a valuable document not only in connection with him, but for the well-being and knowledge of the people at large and that it should be printed as a public document. There are sundry illustrations. Whether the illustrations will be printed or not I can not say, but I desire to present it for the consideration of the Senate with the request that it be made a public document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paper will be received and referred to the Committee on Printing.

TEN EYCK DE WITT VEEDER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there further concurrent or other resolutions? If there are none, morning business is closed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 694, being Senate bill 3000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the bill by title, for the present consideration of which the Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I ask to what bill the Senator from New Hampshire refers?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title of the bill will be stated from the desk.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 3000) for the relief of Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. President, is that a bill which is already on the calendar?

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. THORNTON. I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill notwithstanding the objection.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the bill be read, so that we may know what it contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi asks that the bill be read. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder, now a commodore on the retired list of the United States Navy, to the active list of rear admirals of the United States Navy to take rank next after Rear Admiral Charles Brainerd Taylor Moore, United States Navy: *Provided*, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, by the usual examination prescribed by law for the grade of rear admiral in the United States Navy, his physical, mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform the duties of said grade: *Provided further*, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall

be carried as additional to the number in the grade to which he may be appointed under this act: *And provided further*, That the said Ten Eyck De Witt Veeder shall not by the passage of this act be entitled to back pay of any kind.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I should like to have the report on that bill read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion having been made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of the bill, it must be disposed of without debate. The Chair is not prepared to rule just at this moment whether the reading of the report at this time would be in the nature of debate, and unless some Senator objects the Chair will direct the Secretary to read the report.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand this is on the motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think, under the rule, this is not a debatable motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That has been the ruling of the Chair; but when it comes to reading the report accompanying the bill there is an element of doubt about it, and the Chair would always resolve that in favor of its being read.

Mr. GALLINGER. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Very well. The question is on the adoption of the motion made by the Senator from New Hampshire, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just read. [Putting the question.] The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I shall have to question that decision. I demand the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks for the yeas and nays on his motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], which I transfer to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], and vote "nay."

Mr. TOWNSEND (when the name of Mr. SMITH of Michigan was called). I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] and to state that he is paired on all votes with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED]. This announcement may stand for all votes to-day.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when Mr. WARREN's name was called). I desire to announce the unavoidable absence from the city of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] and to state that he is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER]. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CRAWFORD (after having voted in the negative). I observe that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WEEKS (after having voted in the affirmative). I notice that the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has not voted. I have a general pair with that Senator, which I transfer to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. CHILTON. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], which I transfer to the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS], and vote "nay." I desire further to state that the Senator from New Mexico is necessarily absent on account of serious illness in his family.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and vote "nay."

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (after having voted in the negative). The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] having entered the Chamber and voted, I wish to withdraw the announcement of my transfer, and, in consequence of my pair with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BURLEIGH] with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLISS];

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN];

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT] with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]; and

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN].

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—30.

Borah	Gallinger	McCumber	Smoot
Brady	Goff	McLean	Sterling
Brandeggee	Gronna	Oliver	Sutherland
Burton	Jones	Perkins	Townsend
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Poinexter	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Lee, Md.	Pomerene	Works
Dillingham	Lippitt	Root	
du Pont	Lodge	Smith, Md.	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Hughes	Reed	Swanson
Bankhead	Johnson	Robinson	Thomas
Bristow	Kern	Shafroth	Thompson
Bryan	Lane	Sheppard	Thornton
Camden	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Tillman
Chilton	Norris	Shively	Vardaman
Culbertson	O'Gorman	Simmons	Walsh
Fletcher	Page	Smith, Ga.	White
Gore	Pittman	Smith, S. C.	
Hardwick	Ransdell	Stone	

NOT VOTING—28.

Burleigh	Fall	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury
Cañon	Hitchcock	Myers	Sherman
Clapp	Hollis	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Clarke, Ark.	James	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Coit	La Follette	Overman	Stephenson
Crawford	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Warren
Cummins	Lewis	Penrose	Williams

So Mr. GALLINGER's motion was not agreed to.

CIVIL WAR VOLUNTEER OFFICERS' RETIRED LIST.

Mr. TOWNSEND and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan. Mr. TOWNSEND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 392.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion now before the Senate will have to be disposed of.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not yield at this time, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. As I understand, the motion to take up the urgent deficiency bill is privileged.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate has before it the motion made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, is it in order to move as a substitute for that motion a motion to take up another bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. No.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It can only be antagonized by a privileged motion.

Mr. OVERMAN. A motion to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill is privileged.

Mr. GALLINGER. Oh, no.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is made before 2 o'clock. The Chair will put the motion of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). In the absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA], with whom I have a general pair, I withhold my vote.

Mr. FLETCHER (when his name was called). I make the same announcement as before, as to my pair and its transfer, and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer I made on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and must withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ROOT (after having voted in the affirmative). May I inquire if the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That Senator has not voted.

Mr. ROOT. Having a pair with that Senator, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have been requested to announce that the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] is unavoidably absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. McLEAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I inquire if the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He has not voted.

Mr. McLEAN. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN] and vote "nay."

Mr. CRAWFORD. I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON] and vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 38—as follows:

YEAS—35.

Borah	Cummins	Lane	Perkins
Brady	Dillingham	Lippitt	Poinexter
Brandeggee	du Pont	Lodge	Smoot
Bristow	Gallinger	McCumber	Sterling
Burton	Goff	Martine, N. J.	Sutherland
Chamberlain	Gronna	Nelson	Townsend
Clapp	Jones	Norris	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Oliver	Works
Crawford	La Follette	Page	

NAYS—38.

Ashurst	Hughes	Robinson	Stone
Bankhead	James	Shafroth	Swanson
Bryan	Johnson	Sheppard	Thornton
Camden	Lee, Md.	Shields	Tillman
Chilton	O'Gorman	Shively	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Overman	Simmons	Walsh
Culbertson	Pittman	Smith, Ariz.	White
Fletcher	Pomerene	Smith, Ga.	Williams
Gore	Ransdell	Smith, Md.	
Hardwick	Reed	Smith, S. C.	

NOT VOTING—23.

Burleigh	Kern	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Cañon	Lea, Tenn.	Owen	Stephenson
Coit	Lewis	Penrose	Thomas
Fall	McLean	Root	Thompson
Hitchcock	Martin, Va.	Saulsbury	Warren
Hollis	Myers	Sherman	

So Mr. TOWNSEND's motion was rejected.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 6856, Order of Business No. 737.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before that motion is put, I desire to ask the Senator, if the bill referred to by him is taken up and made the unfinished business, whether he will be willing to have it laid aside for the purpose of taking up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill?

Mr. LODGE. Debate is not in order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing that it shall be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. GALLINGER. Debate is out of order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. But Senators can interrogate one another as to the effect of the motion.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be willing to lay it aside temporarily in order to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. I understand, then, that if this bill is made the unfinished business, the Senator will lay aside the bill until the appropriation bill has been considered?

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. The Senator can not do that.

Mr. LODGE. It requires unanimous consent to lay aside a bill temporarily.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. LODGE. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Before the question is put, I should like to inquire what the bill is to which the Senator from Florida refers?

Mr. LODGE. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the title of the bill.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill the title of which has just been stated. On that motion the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the name of Mr. ASHURST, and he voted "yea."

Mr. DU PONT. I ask that the bill may be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is too late.

The Secretary resumed the calling of the roll.

Mr. CHILTON (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the former ballot, I vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia makes an announcement, which may stand for the day. The Secretary will proceed with the calling of the roll.

Mr. CRAWFORD (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. STEPHENSON], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. REED (when his name was called). Making the same transfer as before, I vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE]. Being unable to obtain a transfer, I must withhold my vote. The roll call was concluded.

Mr. SWANSON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. MARTIN] is detained from the city on account of illness in his family. He is paired with the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN]. If my colleague were present he would vote "yea." I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have a pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. COLT]. If at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—46.

Ashurst	Johnson	Poindexter	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Kenyon	Pomerene	Smith, S. C.
Bryan	Kern	Ransdell	Stone
Camden	La Follette	Reed	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Robinson	Thomas
Chilton	Lee, Md.	Shafroth	Thompson
Culberson	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Thornton
Fletcher	Myers	Shields	Tillman
Gore	Norris	Shively	Walsh
Hardwick	O'Gorman	Simmons	White
Hughes	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	
James	Pittman	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—29.

Brady	Dillingham	McCumber	Sterling
Brandege	du Pont	McLean	Sutherland
Bristow	Gallinger	Nelson	Townsend
Burton	Goff	Oliver	Vardaman
Clapp	Gronna	Page	Weeks
Clark, Wyo.	Jones	Perkins	
Crawford	Lippitt	Root	
Cummins	Lodge	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—21.

Borah	Hitchcock	Owen	Warren
Burleigh	Hollis	Penrose	Williams
Cañon	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	Works
Clarke, Ark.	Lewis	Sherman	
Colt	Martin, Va.	Smith, Mich.	
Fall	Newlands	Stephenson	

So Mr. FLETCHER's motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 6856) to authorize the United States, acting through a shipping board, to subscribe to the capital stock of a corporation to be organized under the laws of the United States, or of a State thereof, or of the District of Columbia, to purchase, construct, equip, maintain, and operate merchant vessels in the foreign trade of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Florida, in charge of the bill which has just been taken up by vote, what the Senator's purpose is, so far as pressing the bill for immediate consideration is concerned, if the Senator chooses to answer my question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I will state that, so far as I am concerned, we desire to press the bill and to get as early consideration of it and as early disposition of it as possible. I am perfectly willing, however, to lay it aside temporarily in order to dispose of the appropriation bills.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator, I assume, is aware of the fact that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] has given notice that he proposes to file a minority report on this bill, and which has not as yet been filed. Does the Senator think it would be the proper thing to take up so important a measure as this before the views of the minority have been placed before the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. I will say, in that connection, that there was what might be called an understanding, to the effect that the minority would file their views within three days after the majority report had been filed. The majority report was filed more than three days ago, and I assumed that perhaps the minority were ready to present their views.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me—

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. The minority report has been prepared. There has been some delay in printing exhibits and revising the copy of the report. I think it will be ready within an hour, however. As I recall, this is the third day. The majority report was filed on Wednesday, and this is the third legislative

day after that—one holiday, New Year's Day, having intervened, and Sunday.

I should say, however, that it was understood in the Committee on Commerce that the time given for filing the minority report should not interfere with the bringing up of the bill. That was the understanding at the time. Of course that does not foreclose any Senator on the floor from asking for time to give it more mature consideration.

Right here, if it is necessary, and if the Senator will yield further to me, I ask leave to file the minority report (Rept. No. 841, pt. 2) during the day. I think it will be ready to send to the desk within an hour.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think under the circumstances I might proceed with the consideration of the bill. We probably will not dispose of it to-day.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it would be most extraordinary for any Senator to force consideration of a great measure such as this when those interested in it as deeply as some of us are have not had an opportunity to read the views of the minority. I suggest to the Senator that probably nothing will be gained by undue haste in this regard.

Mr. President, it has come to our ears on this side of the Chamber that there is to be undue haste in the consideration of this bill, that it is to be pressed in season and out of season, at seasonable hours and unseasonable hours. Those of us who do not think the bill is of sufficient consequence to warrant action of that kind will be compelled to resist it in every proper and parliamentary way.

I feel very sure that the Senator from Florida, who is always gracious and always fair, will see not only the propriety but the necessity of giving us a little time to prepare ourselves for the discussion of a measure that is of far-reaching consequence and that the people of the United States are very deeply interested in, and will be more interested in before this debate closes, I feel very sure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have no desire, of course, to press the matter in such a form as would cause any inconvenience to the other side or prevent the consideration of the views of the minority. I am perfectly willing to say now that I will lay aside the bill to be taken up to-morrow upon the close of the morning business if that would be agreeable to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, the Senator will probably have votes enough to take it up. I certainly have no objection to its being laid aside for the consideration of appropriation bills, which I think are of much greater consequence than this bill possibly can be to the people of the country. My view is that we ought to pass the supply bills and go home, and not to force it upon the Congress at this short session, after the experience we have had in the last three years of sitting here continuously, considering bills such as this. The time is too short to properly consider the measure, and it is not in the line of good legislation.

Of course we will all use our own judgment as to the proper mode of procedure; but I repeat, Mr. President, that any undue haste to press this bill upon the Senate will not, in my judgment, facilitate its passage. I think we ought to be dealt with generously about the matter. It is opening a great new question containing propositions that the American people will want to understand fully before the bill is enacted into a law.

For myself, having been extremely busy during the few days we have been in session in considering appropriation bills, I am not prepared at the present time, as I would wish to be, to proceed to the discussion of the bill, and as I shall endeavor to be if generous treatment is accorded to the minority, or to those of us who are opposed to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I say—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have offered to temporarily lay aside the bill in order to take up the emergency deficiency appropriation bill and dispose of it. I have offered to temporarily lay aside the bill, to have it taken up to-morrow upon the conclusion of the morning business. Neither of these suggestions seems to be agreeable to the other side, and I know of no other way of proceeding except to go on in the regular way with the bill. Others may think it is not an important measure, but a great many people do. For my part I do not believe there is any more important matter affecting the interests of all the people of the whole country than what this measure will accomplish. But I do not want to delay it indefinitely. I want to bring the matter before the Senate and have it considered fully and in order and disposed of. I am willing to do anything I can to accommodate Senators on the other side and to meet their views, but I do not want to be in the position of doing nothing and having the time pass without any action whatever.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. GALLINGER. I yield the floor.

Mr. JONES. I wish to suggest to the Senator from New Hampshire something of which he is probably aware as indicating the character of argument and the means the other side intend to use to put this bill through. The majority leader of the Senate was quoted as having said immediately after the President's message with reference to this bill, "We have the votes to put it through."

Mr. GALLINGER. I observed that, and I have had it whispered in an ear that always serves me well that, assuming they have the votes, they are going to resort to tactics which will be opposed as strenuously as possible, so far as a few of us are concerned, at least.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, we have the votes to put it through if ever we can get a chance to vote. Unless Senators on the other side adopt some plan or scheme of inexcusable and unpardonable obstruction we will get to a vote, and we have the votes to pass the bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senators on this side should resort to the same tactics that the Senator's colleague resorted to on the immigration bill, would he think that that was very much to be condemned?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I am not discussing what occurred on other bills or what individual Senators have done. It is rather an impertinent question for the Senator to propound, and I think an improper one, to ask me to animadvert upon the conduct of any Senator, and particularly on that of my own colleague. I am speaking as to this bill. I am answering the statements made in the form of criticism by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator is oversensitive.

Mr. STONE. No; I am not at all.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has on more than one occasion, with a great deal of earnestness and with some acerbity, during the past few months charged this side of the Chamber with unduly and improperly obstructing legislation. Now, Mr. President, for one, I propose to be the judge of my own conduct in this matter, and I shall pursue such a course in the debate on this bill as I think the importance of the measure demands at my hands.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask the Senator from Florida to yield to me to call up House bill 20241, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. I object to laying the bill aside by unanimous consent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection being made, the bill will have to be disposed of in some other way.

Mr. LODGE. I wish to say a very few words upon the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is before the Senate. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to make a motion?

Mr. OVERMAN. I give notice that I shall make the motion after 2 o'clock to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire to delay the consideration of the urgent deficiency bill, but I want to say a word in regard to this bill just taken up. It is a bill of very vast consequence. It enters upon a wholly new policy—one never adopted by this country before and, so far as I know, never adopted by any civilized maritime power. I know of no measure which requires more thorough debate than this one, and the question is not to be met by a bald statement that "we have got the votes." That, no doubt, is a great advantage. As Mr. Pitt said once, the time has now come to apply the majority, and I suppose that the Mr. Pitts on the other side are taking that view at this time.

But the rules of the Senate are designed to give us fair discussion, and this bill can not be jammed through to-morrow or the next day. Here is a bill of this enormous consequence brought in, on which there have been no hearings at all and on which information is lacking as to the facts, a bill on which even the minority report is not printed.

I think, Mr. President, that we are entitled to an opportunity to discuss this bill fairly and fully, and when that fair and full discussion is completed I assume a vote will be taken and the majority will then be applied.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. FLETCHER. I simply wish to suggest that there is no disposition on this side to limit debate or to prevent a fair and full discussion of the bill at all. There is no disposition, as

the Senator expressed it, to jam through the bill, even if we had the power to do it. Certainly we have not any power to prevent an ample discussion and consideration of the bill. We simply want to get it before the Senate for that very purpose, so that Senators can proceed, and, whether they are ready or not, we on this side are prepared to discuss it.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is our first duty to deal with the appropriation bills. The only thing which will make an extra session inevitable is the failure of some of the appropriation bills. I think our first duty, therefore, is to dispose of those great supply bills.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There is but one before the Senate at present, and that is the emergency deficiency bill, and it is proposed this afternoon to call it up. I think it can be disposed of very shortly.

Mr. LODGE. We will see about that when we get to it. I have no objection to taking up the urgent deficiency bill, but I think there is likely to be a little conversation about some of the items in that bill.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am not familiar with the items in that bill.

Mr. LODGE. I am familiar with only one item, and I shall have something to say about it.

Mr. OVERMAN. To be frank, I want to make a motion after 2 o'clock, because if the pending bill is before the Senate at 2 o'clock it then becomes the unfinished business for every day. If the appropriation bill were taken up now, of course the shipping bill would lose its place. I will be frank to state that when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives I shall move to take up the appropriation bill.

Mr. LODGE. I shall certainly not resist that motion, but, Mr. President, I am referring more to what the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] said as to going on with this bill to-morrow, taking it up immediately after the routine morning business, not allowing us to consider any other bills in the morning hour, not allowing us to do anything with the calendar, but this bill is to be taken up and kept here all day, and I suppose that 11 o'clock sessions will be begun, and night sessions will be attempted.

Mr. President, I think this bill is altogether too important to be treated in that way. I think those who are opposed to it, as well as those who favor it, are entitled to a reasonable opportunity not only to speak but to prepare themselves. This is not a bill which can be dealt with in a few words. I regard the bill as thoroughly vicious legislation, both economically and internationally. I know that it will at once involve the Government in an expenditure of \$30,000,000. No human being of any ordinary sense will become a partner with the Government as the predominant partner in an enterprise in which it is avowed beforehand that it is the intention to lose money. Therefore we may be sure that the whole of the \$30,000,000 will be involved. To our liberal friends on the other side \$30,000,000 may seem a trifle. I think at this time it is an expenditure to be considered.

Then, Mr. President, having got our corporation established with the United States as the owner, not merely the predominant owner, but the owner, we are to put those ships into trade. I am speaking only of the economic side now. We are to put them into the foreign trade.

The United States, with all its vast power and all its great resources, is unable to carry on a merchant marine which will take care of all the freight of the United States, and wherever they place one of these Government-owned ships on a given route you will look in vain for an American vessel to be run there, for nobody will go into competition with a Government line. When you establish these ships on those lines, where they run you may be sure that all hope of building up an American merchant marine in that direction is dissipated once and for all.

Now, those are a few of the economic reasons which seem to me of very great importance.

Then we come to the international side. We are establishing a set of merchant vessels owned by the Government. Let us consider what that would mean in time of peace. It would create a very new condition. All Government ships to-day have reciprocal privileges. Ships of one Government and ships of another have reciprocal privileges in each other's harbors. No clearance is needed. No port dues are exacted. Is it to be supposed that these ships, trading ships, are to be given those privileges by other nations?

The matter of collisions, of ordinary accidents, raises many very important questions. I know of but one case where this matter was at all involved, the case known from the name of the ship as the *Parlement Belge*. It was a ship of that name carrying the mails, I think, between Ostend, or some Belgian

port, and an English port. There was a collision, and the question was raised about Government ownership, and it was finally decided on an appeal to the House of Lords that the ship did not lose her Government character because, in addition to the Government work, she also carried passengers. In that case the vessel was merely in the nature of a ferryboat, but here we have a whole series of ships loaded with merchandise, regular traders.

Now, those are some of the difficulties that arise in time of peace. How much more so in time of war? It is an undoubted neutral right, freely exercised by us during our Civil War, to stop neutral ships and examine them for contraband. It is a recognized right of international law. It is, however, one thing to stop a privately owned ship, and a very different thing to stop a ship that is Government owned.

What is to be the status of the men on board the ship? Are they to be officers of the United States like the officers of the Navy? Are the crew to be enlisted men or are they to be like ordinary captains and crews of merchant ships?

I merely mention a few of the questions that necessarily arise when we take this new, utterly new, step.

Other nations have owned railroads; they have owned telegraphs; they have owned telephones and other means of communication operated wholly within their own boundaries; but no maritime nation within my knowledge, no matter how strong the socialistic desire for Government ownership might be, has ever attempted to apply those doctrines to merchant shipping, because merchant shipping is not within their own control; it is not within their own boundaries; it goes out onto the high seas and has to meet a world of international complications. Have we not enough international complications now about us and likely to arise without encouraging new and perilous questions?

It is proposed, as I understand this bill, and as I certainly know the President said, to run these ships at a loss until they begin to make money, and then to turn them over to private ownership. Why, Mr. President, what becomes of this opposition to subsidy then? There never has been proposed any subsidy so gross as that which I have just quoted, and which was flatly stated by the President in his message.

Mr. President, I have no intention of arguing the bill to-day; I am not prepared to argue it; I am simply indicating some of the general questions of political economy and of international law which are involved in the bill. I think that not only as a matter of courtesy we should be, but as a matter of right we must be, permitted fully to debate this measure, and that every opportunity should be given to discuss a measure of this magnitude as it deserves to be discussed. I have no desire to throw any artificial obstructions in the way of the proper consideration of the bill; but I say very frankly that if any attempt is made to cut off proper discussion of the bill, I for one shall be ready to do what I have never before done in the Senate—use every possible means of parliamentary obstruction in order that we may have opportunity to discuss the bill fairly and fully and as a measure of such great magnitude ought to be discussed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Commerce which reported this bill, I think I should say that during the time when it was being considered by the committee I was engaged in work before other committees and was unable to be present. I did not enjoy the benefit of the hearings, if any hearings were held, and did not participate in the making up of the report.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do.

Mr. BURTON. I will say, in regard to hearings, that none were held. The minority requested that those who were experts in the shipping business, those who were posted on these subjects, might be called before the committee and brief hearings be had, but the majority voted down a motion to have hearings and insisted upon the immediate report of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. However that may be, Mr. President, in justice to myself I simply desire to say, in order that my position may be known, that I did not join in the report, not having been present, and I have not seen fit to present views representing the minority. I voted this morning against taking up the bill to-day for consideration. That in no manner indicates hostility on my part to the bill; but evidently it is a bill of such very great importance that it ought to be fully considered, and especially if hearings were not had in committee.

So far as I am concerned, my attitude is simply this: I have had a feeling that something should be done to promote our carrying trade under the American flag, and possibly this ex-

periment, by in a limited way establishing a line that shall be run on schedule time for a period, might demonstrate that it would end in a successful building up of such carrying trade; yet I have not reached a conclusion in the matter, and, for one, I want to hear a discussion of so important a question upon its merits and value before I shall be able to conclude whether or not I shall support the bill. On that account I do not care to be put in the attitude of having participated in the recommendation of the committee favoring the passage of the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, of course Senators know perfectly well, as I have before suggested, that we would not be able to prevent a full and exhaustive discussion of this measure even if we desired to do so; Senators understand perfectly well that they will have all the time they desire to consider the measure from all standpoints, upon every phase, and to discuss it as long and as fully as they like. There is no disposition to have it take any other course. We can not be charged with unduly pressing an important measure.

The bill has been presented to the Senate and a full report has been made upon it. The matter has been more or less under consideration, I have no doubt, in the minds of Senators anyway, for some time past. There were some hearings on a similar bill which was introduced in the other House. People who desired to be heard were given the opportunity to appear before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries there, which handled the bill. Certain hearings were had, which were sufficient, anyway, I take it, to satisfy that committee, and the bill was favorably reported in the other House.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is a House bill. Does the Senator from Florida say that there were hearings on the bill before the committee of the other House?

Mr. FLETCHER. Yes; precisely.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are such hearings printed?

Mr. FLETCHER. They are printed and they are available.

Mr. GALLINGER. They were very limited, were they not?

Mr. FLETCHER. The hearings were not very extensive, I should say, but my understanding is that sufficient opportunity was given for all the people who desired to be heard to be heard before that committee, and those hearings have been printed.

Mr. GALLINGER. I asked the question for the reason that I have had letters from various parties in New England asking if hearings could not be secured before the Senate committee and complaining that they had not been given proper opportunity to present their views when the bill was before the House. I simply state that for what it is worth.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield to me for a moment, I wish to say that the House minority report, if I recall it correctly, complained that there was no time for sufficient hearings and that the information was lacking—that is one of the objections they made—on which to found the measure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I can not say as to what took place there, except that certain hearings were had, and that they are printed and are available. Whatever they show speaks for itself.

Mr. President, I can not add to what the report of the committee, which has been presented and printed and is on the desks of Senators, expresses regarding the general nature and purpose of this measure. I feel that it is unnecessary to go into a detailed consideration of the provisions of the bill so far as explaining the bill is concerned. It is a very simple measure; there are no complicated or involved proposition about it; it is easily and readily understood. No amount of argument or discussion of the provisions of the bill would give any further light than would be gathered by simply reading the bill. As I have said, the report of the committee, so far as we have been able to make it, fully covers all the features of the proposed legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not care to ask the Senator, if he expects to discuss it later, but I was going to ask him a question or two in regard to the bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. I would be glad if the Senator would postpone his inquiries for the time, because I may answer just what is in the Senator's mind in the course of my remarks.

Mr. NORRIS. Is the Senator going to discuss the provisions of the bill at this time?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is my intention to do so.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; the bill has not been read yet.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to conform to the Senator's desires, of course, but I took it from what he just said that he was not going into an explanation of the bill at this time.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was saying that it was unnecessary to take up the bill section by section and discuss it by way of explaining the bill, but I was proceeding to say that, in so far as it involved a departure from the previous policy of the Government, there would be occasion for giving reasons for the measure, and as to that matter I propose to present, so far as I can, the reasons which seem to call for this legislation at this time. On that phase of the matter I shall offer some observations, perhaps a little extended.

Mr. NORRIS. The questions I desire to ask the Senator would not be connected with any reasons that might exist for a departure from present or past practices. I wanted to ask the Senator a few questions in regard to the meaning of some parts of the bill, but I will not ask them now if he prefers that I should ask the questions later on.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well; I have no objection if the Senator desires to ask the questions now. If I can throw any light on the subject, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if the committee have made any change in the bill wherein it was provided that after the shipping corporation had been organized and had either built or purchased ships, put them in operation, and had operated various lines, it was within the power of the shipping board or of the President to dispose of the ships which have been so purchased to private parties? Has there been any change made in the bill in that respect?

Mr. FLETCHER. There is no change in that regard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will suggest that it would be more regular to permit the bill to be read at this time and allow it to be presented formally to the Senate under the order heretofore adopted.

Mr. FLETCHER. I was going to suggest, Mr. President, that that perhaps had better be done.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course when the bill is read we will all understand it thoroughly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is necessary to read the bill under the order heretofore adopted. The Secretary will read the bill.

Mr. LODGE. I think that if this bill is to be read now, and therefore deprive the Senate of hearing it read later, we ought to have a quorum here to listen to it, and I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts makes the point of no quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Bryan	James	Overman	Shafroth
Burton	Kenyon	Page	Sheppard
Clarke, Ark.	Lane	Perkins	Stone
Crawford	Lee, Md.	Pittman	Thornton
du Pont	Lodge	Polandexter	White
Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Ransdell	
Gallinger	Nelson	Root	
Hardwick	Norris	Saulsbury	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Twenty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will call the list of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CAMDEN, Mr. CHILTON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. O'GORMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. SHIVELY, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. SMITH of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. SMOOT, Mr. STERLING, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. VARDAMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is absent on account of a slight indisposition.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. BORAH, Mr. GOFF, Mr. GRONNA, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. TILMAN, Mr. KERN, and Mr. SMITH of South Carolina entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States, acting through the shipping board hereinafter created, may subscribe to the capital stock of any corporation now or hereafter organized under the laws of the United States or of any State thereof or of the District of Columbia upon the terms and conditions herein mentioned.

SEC. 2. That the object of such corporation shall be the purchase, construction, equipment, maintenance, and operation of merchant vessels in the trade between the Atlantic, Gulf, or Pacific ports of the United States and the ports of Central and South America and elsewhere to meet the requirements of the foreign commerce of the United States. The initial capital stock of such corporation shall not be over \$10,000,000, of the par value of \$100 per share, but the shipping board,

with the approval of the President, may consent to or cause an increase of the capital stock from time to time, as the interests of the corporation may require: *Provided*, That the United States shall subscribe for 51 per cent of each and every such increase. The United States shall subscribe to 51 per cent of such stock at par, and the remainder thereof shall be offered for public subscription. The United States may further subscribe at par to an amount of such stock equal to that not taken by public subscription. Such corporation may begin business as soon as 51 per cent of such stock has been subscribed and paid for by the United States.

SEC. 3. That the United States, through the shipping board and with the approval of the President, is authorized to purchase or construct vessels suitable, in the judgment of the shipping board, for the purposes of such corporation, with a view to transferring them to such corporation, and for this purpose the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the request of the shipping board, may issue and sell or use for such purchases or construction any of the bonds of the United States now available in the Treasury of the United States under the act of August 5, 1909, the act of February 4, 1910, and the act of March 2, 1911, relating to the issue of bonds for the construction of the Panama Canal, to a total amount not to exceed \$30,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing or constructing such vessels.

SEC. 4. That the shipping board is authorized to transfer the vessels purchased or constructed as herein provided to such corporation, and such corporation shall issue to the United States in payment thereof its gold bonds bearing interest at not less than 4 per cent per annum, and upon such further terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the shipping board, such bonds to constitute a first and paramount lien upon such vessels thus transferred and upon all the property of such corporation: *Provided*, That the amount of bonds received by the United States in payment for such vessels shall not be less, at the then par value, than the total amount expended by the United States in the purchase or construction of such vessels, and same may be sold by the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion and with the approval of the President, to reimburse the Treasury for expenditures made in the purchase or construction of vessels. Such corporation shall make suitable provision for sinking fund and for the depreciation charges under the rules and regulations to be prescribed by such shipping board.

SEC. 5. That vessels purchased or constructed by such shipping board and conveyed to such corporation as herein provided shall be entitled to registry under the laws of the United States, and shall be deemed vessels of the United States and entitled to the benefits and privileges appertaining to such vessels, except such vessels shall engage only in trade with foreign countries or with the Philippine Islands and the islands of Guam and Tutuila. Such vessels shall be subject to the navigation laws of the United States except as herein provided.

SEC. 6. That, subject to the direction of the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster General, and the Secretary of Commerce are hereby constituted a board to be known as the shipping board, with full power to vote the stock of the United States in such corporation and to do all other things necessary to protect the interests of the United States and to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 7. That, with the approval of the Congress, such shipping board may at any time sell the stock of such corporation owned by the United States.

SEC. 8. That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to charter, lease, or transfer vessels purchased or constructed under the provisions of this act and such naval auxiliaries now belonging to the Naval Establishment of the United States as are suitable for commercial use and which are not required for use in the Navy in time of peace, and vessels now owned and operated by the Panama Railroad Co., to any corporation now or hereafter organized as in this act provided or to any other corporation or corporations now or hereafter organized, upon such terms and conditions as the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall prescribe. The vessels purchased or constructed by the United States through the shipping board, with the approval of the President of the United States, shall be of a type, as far as the commercial requirements of the foreign trade of the United States may permit, suitable for use as naval auxiliaries in the Naval Establishment of the United States.

SEC. 9. That the President of the United States shall at any time have the right, upon giving written notice of his intention to the corporation using the vessels under the provisions of this act, to take possession for use as naval auxiliaries in the United States Navy or for other purposes of any vessels used by such corporation at a reasonable price or rental.

SEC. 10. That a detailed statement of all expenditures under this act and of all receipts hereunder shall be submitted to Congress at the beginning of each regular session.

SEC. 11. That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000,000.

SEC. 12. That this act shall take effect from its passage.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment. Unless there is objection, the committee amendments will be first considered. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I do not wish at this time to enter upon a discussion of the merits of this bill, but I do wish to say a very few words regarding the discussion of the bill.

I think it is a bill of vast importance. I have known of no measure laid before the Senate in the past half dozen years which seemed to me weighted with such consequence as is this bill.

There are three major lines of consideration, upon each one of which we must regard this bill as of very great consequence to the people of the country. The first and least is that it proposes to embark the Government of the United States upon a very large expense in a business venture of a kind in which the private enterprise of the United States has uniformly met with loss rather than profit, and it proposes to embark the Government in such a venture practically without limit imposed by the Congress of the United States.

I say that is the least of the reasons why this bill must be regarded as of great importance. A second and more important reason is that it proposes to put the Government of the United States into the foreign trade at a time when that trade neces-

sarily involves frequent, almost constant, questions of critical importance, of great delicacy and difficulty, arising upon the law of nations regarding neutral and belligerent rights. It proposes to put the Government of the United States in a position where her good faith will be questioned, where her violation of the law of nations will be asserted, if any situations arise such as have been detailed to us within a few days by the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH]. It proposes to create a condition where it will be no mere question of an individual citizen of the United States undertaking and succeeding or failing in carrying contraband to a belligerent, but where the same state of facts will raise the question of the United States violating its neutrality and taking sides with one belligerent or another.

That is the second reason. The third is that this bill proposes a reversal of the policy which has been followed by this Government from the beginning. It proposes to embark the Government of the United States in a business far more extreme than would be the ownership of railroads, far more extreme as an exercise of governmental authority than would be the ownership of telegraph and telephone lines. It proposes to put the Government of the United States in a position where it will step in and remedy the defects, the shortcomings, the failures of individual enterprise by raising money by taxation from all the people in order to carry on the business that individual enterprise has not carried on; and that, sir, means a complete reversal of the policy of the United States. It means a new departure on a line of Government action more important, more fateful in its results than any act which has ever been passed by this Congress since I, since you, Mr. President [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair], became a Member of this body. It means a repudiation more signal than has ever yet been made of the principles of the great leader of the party which "has the votes" to put this bill through.

Sir, there has been no discussion here since I have been in this body so imperative in its demands upon the Members of the Senate as the discussion of this bill. There has been no measure going so deep to the basis of our institutions as this bill. It comes here, sir, under circumstances which are repugnant. There was no hearing before the committee of the House on such a measure as we have before us. There was no hearing before the committee of the Senate. The demand for a hearing was refused, and the bill was reported speedily, peremptorily, with but slight opportunity for discussion; and now, sir, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], in advance, with some show of feeling, which I know was evanescent and which, I trust, does not even now continue, has stigmatized all discussion of this bill on the part of the minority as—what were the words?—"improper and unjustifiable."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], with that kindness and fairness which always characterize him, has told us that there was no disposition to interfere with the debate on this bill, but the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] in advance gives notice to the country that the debate on this bill is to be regarded as obstructive, improper, and unjustifiable. I protest against any such spirit dominating this body, whether it be on the part of those who have the votes or not. May the time be far distant when there is so little spirit of independence, so little courage, so little loyalty to the duty of a minority in this body that such a notice in advance is accepted without just resentment.

Mr. President, the discussion of measures in this body does not consist alone in the making of speeches. We discuss measures with but very few Senators here. There are not 20 in the room at this moment. I counted them a few minutes ago, and there were 14. What, then, is the use of discussion? The use is this, that every speech is going to the country, that every hour passed is calling the attention of the country to the measure. The people of the United States begin to consider, begin to read, begin to discuss, and gradually week by week they form their opinions, and their opinions find their way back here. The process of discussion results ultimately in the reaching of conclusions which are conformable to the will and judgment of the people of the United States. That, sir, is why the long, patient, and sometimes tedious discussion of questions in the Senate of the United States is of vast utility, although we would suppose that it was useless from counting the men who are listening to the speeches which are made.

Now, Mr. President, this bill, fraught with such great consequences, must have and shall have the kind of discussion which brings these grave and serious questions before the people of the United States and which enables them to form their judgments upon the subjects which are involved.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOR], with his well-trained mind and his habit of analyzing and stating propositions in clear and logical order,

has pointed out three lines of discussion of this bill. I wish to say to him that we are prepared to pursue those lines, and we believe we shall be able to meet every criticism offered under either the first proposition, that the Government is entering upon a business enterprise without precedent and without justification; the second proposition, that the occasion is such that we run the risk of becoming involved in international complications; and the third proposition, that we propose a reversal of the policy of the Government from the beginning. I think we shall be able to show that none of these objections or criticisms are well founded as to this measure.

Generally speaking, Mr. President, and briefly, upon that phase of the matter the bill provides for the organization of a corporation in the District of Columbia or under the laws of some State of the Union having a capital stock of some \$10,000,000, with the power to increase that later if it is determined wise; and that the corporation shall be authorized to enter upon this work and undertaking when 51 per cent of the capital stock is paid up. The bill provides that the Government of the United States, through a shipping board composed of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Postmaster General, shall subscribe to 51 per cent of the capital stock of this corporation; that the remaining 49 per cent shall be offered to the public, and if not taken by the public the Government is authorized and empowered to subscribe and pay for it.

Furthermore, through the shipping board the Secretary of the Treasury is empowered to employ Panama Canal bonds, 3 per cent bonds, running for 50 years, as I recall, and selling now at 99 cents in the open market, practically at par, to the extent of \$30,000,000, in the construction, purchase, charter, lease, and so forth, of vessels for this matter of taking care of the commerce of the United States with foreign countries. Then there is authority given for this corporation to issue its bonds, gold bonds, 4 per cent, and sell them to reimburse the Treasury for the amount expended out of the sales of the Panama bonds.

That is an outline of the plan whereby a corporation formed in this way with this capital stock is authorized to purchase, acquire, lease, charter, and charter to others, ships for the purpose of carrying our products to foreign markets and bringing the products of other countries to this market.

The corporation is then further empowered to dispose of these ships—to sell them, to lease them, as it may be advised is proper and wise—after they shall have served the primary purpose of opening routes of trade and of accommodating the emergency which is upon the country at this time.

Without going further into the details of the bill, I assure the Senate, in the first place, and the country, that it is not a permanent business undertaking on the part of the Government that is intended here. In the next place, the ships flying the United States flag owned by this corporation, instead of running a greater danger and risk than private vessels would run in the matter of carrying what may be regarded as contraband to foreign countries, the very fact, it seems to me, that they were ships owned by a corporation in which the Government was a majority stockholder; the very fact that the Government would have certain power and control in the management of the cargoes and in the navigation of the vessels, and the very fact that the Government is in a position, therefore, to guarantee that there is no violation of the international law in the business upon which the vessels are to be engaged, ought to solve many of the difficulties which we find confronting us to-day, and ought to relieve the situation of tension and stress which we gather from the press comments, at least, there is some indication of at this time.

Mr. President, it is necessary to get a full understanding of present conditions and realize the emergency that exists now, and, in this connection, for us to review a little some of the historical features and facts leading up to the present and to this measure.

We must realize, of course, that at the present time there is practically no merchant marine in foreign trade under the flag of the United States; that less than 1,400,000 tonnage exists to-day of American merchant vessels engaged in foreign commerce; that we are to-day in the hands of foreign ship-owning interests and absolutely dependent upon competitors in the markets of the world for the carrying of our products to those markets.

Various causes have been given for that situation. Among them as causes asserted for the decadence of American foreign shipping are—

First. The substitution of steam for sails as the motive power of ships and the substitution of iron or steel for wood in their construction. This cause need not have worked to our disadvantage. We were slow to adopt the new methods, but for-

oreign countries did not hesitate or delay. While the steel ship costs 30 to 35 per cent more than the wooden ship, it lasts about twice as long, insurance rates are much lower on it and cargo, and it can be built with advantages for loading and discharging, and has other advantages.

Second. The increased cost of shipbuilding, due to increase in cost of materials and labor. This situation did not necessarily operate against us. The steel and iron we have and had when the change occurred in abundance. Our yards were equipped with excellent machinery and appliances. While wages were higher here, this was largely offset by efficiency and other conditions. There was no way to guard against the imposition which our laws allowed our steel makers to practice, such as charging our shipbuilders \$32 per ton for steel which they delivered in Belfast at \$24 per ton.

Third. The increase in maintenance and running expenses. This item need not have been large. The total wage cost is only about 8 to 18 per cent of the total operating expenses of a vessel. An infinitesimal increase in rates or foregoing a small amount of profit would have covered it.

Our existing registration laws forbid any foreign-built vessel from engaging in our coastwise trade. The remedies suggested have been—

First. Free ships. The Dingley law and subsequent tariff acts relieved of duty all material and supplies entering into ships built in the United States for foreign trade. It did not apply to domestic ships, because of the insistence of protected interests. This has not seemed to have any material effect on our merchant marine. To repeal our registry laws and allow shipowners to buy or build wherever they could do so at least cost the ships needed for our commerce would not solve the difficulty because, it is claimed, foreign ships have lower wages on shipboard and, in some instances, receive bounties. We have changed our laws so as to admit to American register ships purchased by Americans anywhere for foreign service, but it appears that as yet it has brought no ships under our flag. It is claimed, also, our laws requiring that American citizens shall officer ships under our flag adds to cost of operation and deters American register. We have authorized the suspension by the President of that requirement.

Second. Discriminating duties. This leads to commercial conflict, in the first place, and, in the next place, we have such a provision in our tariff law. The trouble is, it clashes with numerous treaties and, again, is now involved in litigation. We can not rely on that remedy at present.

Third. Bounty for construction and subsidy for operation. This has been the principal remedy proposed and upon it the greatest stress has been laid.

Turning casually to the hearings before the Merchant Marine Commission, volume 3, page 1753, Rear Admiral P. F. Harrington is quoted:

We must first get the ships, and I think when we get the ships and acquire the ship-owning habit, then the matters of shipbuilders' interest and of shipowners' interest will eventually right themselves, so that they will be able to compete with people abroad.

At page 1754 he said:

My mind rejects the idea of free ships for the reason I stated. My judgment is adverse to the idea of discriminating duties, and there seems to me to be nothing left but a direct payment to shipowners.

At page 1753 he says:

It seems to come right down to this conclusion. If the country wants a great merchant marine, it must pay for it, very much as other nations do.

Rather inconsistent with the idea of subsidy or bounty is the statement at page 1750:

Indeed, the subsidized lines have failed of success in competing with lines which were not subsidized, a conspicuous instance of which was the withdrawal of the Roach Line to Brazil.

Then he gives an interesting account of the American line, subsidized both by the United States and Brazil, which failed. The most perfect and successful cargo carriers—the tramp steamers—were never subsidized by any country. Combinations, rebating, and manipulations will overcome subsidies and bounties. It would seem that none of the means for establishing a mercantile marine which have been suggested can be depended upon to work a success. Equally it follows, since all other methods have been exhausted or found not feasible, there is but one thing to do, and that is to have the Government intervene directly as proposed in S. 6856.

THE SITUATION PRIOR TO AUGUST 1, 1914.

Ships flying our flag carried only about 5 per cent of our commerce. Ships flying foreign flags conveyed freight and passengers to and from practically every port of the world to and from our shores. Great combinations of foreign interests worked against any effort in this country to establish over-sea lines. With unexcelled and improving means of transporting

our products and goods to the ports, indeed our "control stops with the shore." While "man marks the earth with ruin" across the ocean we are commercially helpless on the seas. Our competitors in trade have for years carried the products of our fields, forests, mines, and factories abroad. They have exercised full sway, fixing the sailings, dictated the routes, farmed out the ports, fixed the rates of freights and passenger tariffs, determined the kind, extent, and quality and cost of accommodations for passengers. They alone have had the final word as to where and when we might send our goods. Their one object has been, primarily, to earn profit for themselves. They have not been concerned with any notion to develop trade for us or open routes for our benefit or for the advantage of those with whom we were interchanging. They have simply regarded their own interests, and we have gone on taking and enjoying what was parceled out to us that might be of advantage to those transporting our products and goods.

Particularly with regard to the commerce between North and South America, the shipping monopoly flying European flags and working for their countries have exercised absolute control.

The testimony of Mr. Sidney Story and Mr. William Lowry before the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, under H. R. 587, gives the experience of the Pan American Mail Line, and Mr. J. J. Slechta shows that of the Lloyd Brazilian was similar. Both were forced out of business by the combination of foreign competitors. Agreements governing the traffic to and from South American Republics were regularly entered into, and no independent line could live. (See pp. 154, 164, 165, 166, 170 et seq. of vol. 4 of the report.)

The testimony of shippers and shipping experts clearly shows that a combination existed on the part of foreign shipping interests, having for its purpose the control of America's over-sea commerce, and, in a way, to wring annual tribute from it and to checkmate any efforts made here to expand our trade.

This testimony further showed that there was not a single ship under our flag in the carrying trade between the United States, Brazil, and Argentina, and that all other lines known as American lines—operating ships under foreign flags—had certain routes allotted to them in the trade with the west coast of South and Central America; that these so-called American lines were members of the conference lines, and all dominated by the Foreign Shipping Trust, with headquarters in Europe; that the tariffs or freight rates from United States ports to foreign ports, notably to those of South America, were dictated from Europe and were made so as to secure the bulk of the flow of commerce from South America to Europe and vice versa.

The dividends declared by these foreign lines furnished sufficient denials of the statements that the American lines could not compete with European lines on a legitimate basis. (See Report on Steamship Agreements and Affiliations, etc., vol. 4, pp. 415 to 419, and chap. 6, p. 151 et seq.)

So that not only was our over-sea transportation almost exclusively under foreign flags, but a combination of shipping interests existed, dominated from Europe, which effectually shut out any independent line from the United States.

The United States produces a surplus of the prime necessities of life, which other nations must have or go unclothed and hungry. This means a position of supreme power; a power greater than military or naval power and more lasting, because peace lasts longer than war. But these necessities do not yield to us or serve others as they should, so long as the means of delivering them are in the hands of others and we have no voice on the seas.

We should have our own messengers to send when and where we will over the free and open highways of commerce. We are like a merchant prepared to sell his goods but unable to deliver an article.

The means for carrying our products and manufactures to the market places throughout the world and bringing back to us the commodities we want in exchange, and the drummers over the sea, like the traveling men on land, should be at our command.

We must confess to a humiliating lack of foresight or inexcusable neglect, when we note that upon a foreign trade totaling over \$4,200,000,000, over half of which has been in exports, we have permitted shipping trusts and combinations, all under foreign flags, to levy an annual tribute of between \$200,000,000 and \$300,000,000.

Unquestionably a merchant marine under the American flag is essential to our full commercial development.

Adequate and efficient transportation on the seas under the American flag, owned and controlled exclusively by Americans, it is our business to produce.

We need ships which will deliver our mails direct, and invoices and bills of lading, and do the things which will build up per-

manent trade relations; carry our abundant surplus from fields, forests, and factories to markets; unseal the doors of our shipyards; maintain prosperity within our borders. We must see to it that a war between other countries will not have the effect of paralyzing our industries because we have no means of transporting our products.

Little Holland, with an area of 13,171 square miles, not half as large as Florida, has a mercantile fleet of 400 steamers. As a maritime, financial, and colonial power she takes high rank. So far as I have found, there is no subsidy or bounty for the Netherlands ships.

We should have profited by our experience during the Boer War. That war began in October, 1899. It caused Great Britain to withdraw 250 steamships of an aggregate of 1,000,000 tons from commerce to transport and supply service. The effect was to "cripple opportunities afforded by sending freight to and from America and to raise freights." Our farmers were the worst sufferers, as corn exports were cut off, cotton shipments were reduced—decrease in cereal shipments the following year was 1,750,000 bushels—all because we lacked the ships to deliver the goods. Our total exports of breadstuffs shrunk from \$317,879,746 in 1898 to \$269,955,771 in 1899 and \$250,786,080 in 1900.

The British shipowners withdrew their best vessels to accept profitable Government charters and substituted a few old, cheap craft, but they marked up freight rates 30 per cent, so they made as much out of our diminished commerce as before.

Considering both diminished exports and increased freight rates, the direct and indirect loss to our farmers because of foreign monopoly of a large part of our ocean-carrying business was undoubtedly many million dollars.

An article on the "Development of the American Merchant Marine and American Commerce," Document 141, printed at the request of Senator GALLINGER, January 15, 1906, sounds prophetic in this paragraph after mentioning the experience and effect from the Boer War I have referred to:

WHAT OF A GREATER CONFLICT?

The withdrawal of the trans-Atlantic liners flying British and German flags would mean paralysis to the export trade and a crushing loss to our millions of producers of breadstuffs, cotton, and provisions. Millions of men far inland who had never seen the sea would be demanding of Congress an explanation of why there was no American merchant marine and insisting on an answer.

This article further says:

NO SHIPS TO SOUTH AMERICA.

But it is not only in our trans-Atlantic trade that we are at the mercy of Europe. As President Roosevelt says in his message to the present Congress: "It can not but be a source of regret and uneasiness to us that the lines of communication with our sister Republics of South America should be chiefly under foreign control."

And:

HURTING THE FARMERS MOST.

One accompaniment of the working of this foreign shipping "combine" and these "triangular voyages" is that our American exports to Brazil have fallen from \$15,135,000 in 1895 to \$10,955,000 in 1904. Congress refused a mail subvention of \$200,000 a year and cut off four millions of American commerce. This loss falls most heavily, not on the coast States, but on the agricultural States of the West, for our exports to Brazil were very largely breadstuffs and provisions. We sold to Brazil \$2,683,000 worth of flour in 1895 and only \$1,785,000 in 1904. American consular and other representatives in Brazil all agree that this shrinkage in the flour trade is due primarily to unfavorable freight rates and an irregular shipping service—to a lack of American ships owned and run in American interests. As Consul General Seegar reports, "A Rio commission house made a profit by shipping flour from New York to Europe and thence to Rio, although the increased difference of travel was over 3,000 miles."

NATIONAL AID MEANS LOWER RATES.

From the days when Congress, under the admonition of President Polk, granted the first mail subventions to American steamers on the route to Europe national aid to shipping has always brought not only improved transportation facilities but lower freight rates. Says Lindsay, the historian of the British merchant marine: "Before the Collins (American trans-Atlantic) Line was established the Cunard steamers were receiving £7 10s. sterling per ton freight, which was so much a monopoly rate that in two years after the Collins Line had commenced the rate of freight fell to £4 sterling per ton."

That this is still the result of State aid to shipping is demonstrated anew by some fresh evidence of especial interest to the farmers of the Western States. In 1901 Canada granted a subsidy of \$150,000 for a monthly steamship service from Montreal to South Africa. In 1901 Canada sent only \$26,815 worth of goods to Cape Town and Natal. In 1903 Canada sent \$2,228,000 worth.

AN AMERICAN LINE TO SOUTH AFRICA.

No American steamers run from our ports to South Africa. The trade is in the hands of a foreign shipping monopoly which has lately made a heavy advance in rates. Consul General Washington, who reports "a remarkable growth in the Canadian trade with South Africa since the granting of an annual subsidy by the Canadian Government in 1901," also states significantly:

"A trade report received here from New York dated August 1, 1905, quoted the rates for the next direct steamer from that port to Cape Town as not exceeding \$6.70 per ton; to East London and Durban, \$7.31; and the September sailing from Montreal at \$4.26 for Cape Town and Port Elizabeth, and \$4.87 to East London and Durban."

In other words, because of the establishment of a direct subsidized Canadian line freight rates on Canadian breadstuffs, lumber, provisions, etc., from Montreal to South Africa are from \$2 to \$3 a ton below the

rate exacted by foreign steamships on similar American products from New York to South Africa.

I may say that for the fiscal year 1913 the exports from the United States to Latin America amounted to \$442,419,973 out of a total of exports \$2,465,884,149, 17.94 per cent of total to Latin America, or 6 per cent going to South America. Imports from Latin America to United States, \$323,775,885 out of a total of our imports of \$1,813,008,234, or 17.86 per cent from Latin America, 12 per cent coming from South America, including Mexico and Central America.

WHAT HAS BEEN OUR SITUATION SINCE PRACTICALLY ALL THE OLD WORLD BECAME INVOLVED IN WAR?

Heeding no warnings, closing our eyes to the inevitable in such a contingency, we have drifted along, wrangled some over ways and means, and did nothing. The consequence, which should have been foreseen and guarded against, has been practically a demoralization of our foreign trade. Our abject and sole dependence on foreign ships has placed us in an impotent and deplorable situation. German and Austrian shipping to the amount of some 5,000,000 tonnage has gone suddenly out of commission. A large number of the merchant ships of England, France, and Russia have ceased to engage in peaceful commerce. There is a ship famine on here. The rates of freight have soared to the prohibition point. Cotton is selling in Germany at 19 cents per pound and in our market at 7 cents, and Germany wants 500,000,000 pounds, and we have fifteen times that for sale, and the belligerent nations themselves are willing we should take this cotton to this customer, and we find ourselves without the means of doing it. Phosphate, turpentine, and rosin, and other products which have found their chief markets abroad are weighing down our docks, but we have no craft to take them to the waiting markets. There have been some lines operating under neutral flags, a small tonnage under our flag, but wholly inadequate for our needs, and we have during the past four months paid in freight rates over and above the normal rates, more money than would be required to purchase 60 ships at \$500,000 each. That has been the tax and the burden upon our producers. In the last four months we have actually lost more money than would have been sufficient to have carried out every provision under this bill. Still the rates increase.

A gentleman on board the *New Amsterdam*, which sailed from Rotterdam August 9 for New York, told me he had purchased a cargo of rice or rice meal and loaded it at Hamburg, taking bills of lading and all shipping papers and paying 75 per cent, about \$40,000, the remainder to be paid when the goods were delivered in St. Louis.

Just before the vessel was to sail she was notified not to go, and this American citizen came away with a claim in his pocket for some \$40,000, which he hopes to get liquidated some of these days. If his property had been in American bottoms, he would have come along with it without interruption. No doubt there are numerous instances of that kind in the ports of other countries as well.

No country, whether at war or not, has jurisdiction over the high seas. No country, belligerent or otherwise, has any right to stop our ships on the open seas engaged in customary commerce and say you shall not proceed. This is not denying, however, the right of belligerents to haul to and even board merchantmen to ascertain whether they carry contraband or not and from whence they come and whither bound, but this should be done in an orderly, decent way, without any unnecessary delay or hardship.

The Creator alone rules the seas, and "to all His creatures they are as free as the air they breathe and must be kept so while man remains on earth." No nation can exercise sovereignty over the oceans and seas, which are the inheritance of all the people of the world. They are the highways of commerce for all nations, all races, and all people.

Exporters under international law have the absolute right to ship their goods to any neutral country, regardless of whether they are contraband or not.

If such goods are declared not to be contraband, they can be shipped to Germany, England, France, Russia, or any warring nation. If contraband goods are shipped from the United States to another neutral country, with a view to further shipment to a belligerent nation, the entire shipment may be regarded as a continuous one and the goods will be subject to seizure. It is otherwise if the goods are really intended for a neutral country.

It is clear that goods of all kinds, steel, meat, and everything, contraband or noncontraband, may be shipped without interference from this country to any neutral country.

Goods not declared to be contraband may be shipped to any warring nation as well as to the neutral countries.

If these shipments are made in ships carrying the flag of the United States, that fact ought, and will, no doubt, be accepted

as a guaranty of faithful observance of these principles in making and throughout the shipment. Cargoes of dyestuffs and chemicals are allowed to come from Germany by way of Rotterdam, and cotton can be taken in return the same way, provided ships under the American flag perform the service. The trade of the nations at war with neutral countries has been seriously impaired. Our trade with those neutral countries ought to greatly increase. The contending nations, with no purpose of that kind, we grant, hit us a severe blow when they swept the seas of their own ships, because they were the carriers on which we hitherto relied. South America, which imports over \$900,000,000 in value annually and pays for that with her products, finds many of her markets closed, and, like ourselves, is without the ships to transport her own products or bring to her people the goods they need.

PRIVATE INTERESTS WILL NOT OR CAN NOT SUPPLY THE WANT.

Of the 600,000 tons eligible, only 350,000 tons have come under the American register in response to our call under the act permitting American-owned vessels, wherever built, to take United States register for foreign service. Transportation facilities must be provided, and this whether there is immediate profit or loss on the procuring and employment of those facilities. We must have the means of moving our commerce freely and open new routes for ourselves and those to whom the old channels are closed, and we may feel assured the new channels will remain permanently and become mutually profitable to those using them.

We need the ships—

First, to serve American commerce for the benefit of the whole American people, in order that American farmers, manufacturers, and merchants may send their products and goods over the seas without interference by the demon of war.

Second, to prevent the exorbitant rates, which are approaching the prohibition point in many instances.

Third, to open up new routes, cultivate new markets, and establish our flag over the seas and carry it into every civilized port.

Never again should the United States be found dependent, in a great crisis or otherwise, upon any country or countries for the means of transporting their goods.

Peace or war, it is economic folly to continue permitting—yes, inviting—other countries to dictate the ocean freight rates, the insurance rates, and similar charges, which foreigners have hitherto exacted from our vast foreign commerce. That means putting it in the power of competitors to determine and absorb all profits or advantage from our foreign trade. If there are never to be any more wars by any country anywhere, we still must have a great merchant marine to save ourselves hundreds of millions of ocean freight charges.

We can never hope to be the great commercial Nation we can be if we occupy our present position, where wars among other powers deprive us of their merchant marine, which are the only bottoms we have had to do our carrying for us. Our neutrality is of no avail when other powers at war can not let us have their ships to freight our cargoes across the seas. Our vast foreign commerce in these circumstances is entirely at the mercy of the other powers.

Reviewing the matter somewhat, let me summarize the situation.

When war was declared in Europe England had about 5,000 vessels in the foreign trade, Germany had about 2,000, and the United States had only 6 vessels engaged in trans-Atlantic traffic. These 6 American vessels had a total gross tonnage of 70,362. Two vessels of the German merchant marine—the *Vaterland* and the *Imperator*—exceeded the entire American trans-Atlantic merchant marine by about 25,000 tons. Only one American line operated to South America, to wit, the United States & Brazil Steamship Co., from New York to Brazil. Recognizing the exigencies of the situation, Congress passed an amendment to the navigation laws whereby foreign-built vessels, when owned by American citizens or corporations, could register under the American flag for foreign trade. It was thought that this would bring relief, but it did not.

The President signed the bill on August 18, 1914. On November 14, about 90 days later, the Department of Commerce reports that 101 vessels have registered under the American flag. Their total gross tonnage was 350,000. About 20 of these are sailing vessels, 7 are less than 1,000 tons gross, 10 less than 2,000 tons, 11 less than 3,000, 9 less than 4,000, 18 less than 5,000, 13 less than 6,000, 17 less than 8,000. There are none over 8,000 tons, and few would be classed in size as first-class cargo boats.

It is not intended in any way to disparage the importance of the entry of these vessels to American registration, yet the

value of the increase to American commerce should not be overestimated. While they are thrice welcome, they have not brought the necessary relief. The majority of these vessels are merely continuing the work they have heretofore done in handling freight from American ports. Of the 85 vessels admitted, 23 belong to the United Fruit Co.'s fleet, which continue to ply between the United States and Latin-American ports in the fruit trade; 11 are tankers of the Standard Oil Co. carrying that company's products; 10 belong to United States Steel, handling that company's business, or 44 out of the 85 ships, representing over 50 per cent of the total newly registered tonnage, have added nothing to the transportation facilities for American commerce. The value of the exchange from foreign to American flags by these companies should be fully appreciated and their actions commended, yet the conditions surrounding this transfer should be fully understood.

Of the 85 newly registered ships, less than half are engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade. Including the 6 vessels already under American register, the aggregate gross tonnage of all American vessels engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade is less than 200,000 gross tons. It will not represent one-third of the tonnage of many individual corporations of other nations. Of the German merchant marine, the Hamburg-American has 457 vessels, aggregating 1,361,819 gross tons, the Hamburg-South American, 59 vessels of 268,000 gross tons, and the North-German Lloyd, 168 vessels of 811,000 gross tons. Of the English fleet the Royal Mail Steam Packet Co. has over a million gross tons. The British Indian Steam Navigation Co., 142 vessels of 660,000 tons; the Peninsula Oriental Steam Navigation Co., 70 vessels of 546,000 tons; Furniss, Withy & Co., 125 vessels of 440,000 gross tons. Besides there are many other smaller English companies, carrying the total gross tonnage of England's merchant marine into the millions. One French company has a gross tonnage of 390,000 tons—more than all the American trans-Atlantic merchant marine—and one Japanese corporation owns a fleet of 85 vessels of 368,000 gross tons. Any of these individual corporations will exceed in tonnage and equipment the entire American merchant marine engaged in the trans-Atlantic trade, including vessels recently registered.

The United States has annually paid nearly \$300,000,000 to foreigners to carry our goods. This is a goodly sum in these days of foreign exchange balances, yet it means more than this when our money can not buy the means for transportation of our goods.

German and Austrian shipping have been driven from the sea; the English and French fleets have been considerably reduced by being pressed into Government service or by destruction. We are dependent upon the English and French vessels, the ships of neutral countries, that come to our shore, and the few American bottoms that are capable of ocean voyages. With the foreign vessels attending first to the needs of their own people and their commerce with other parts of the world, we must content ourselves with what we can get.

A shortage of ships is the consequence. Chartering prices have in some cases increased 400 per cent in 60 days, and to obtain ships flying the American flag is almost impossible at any price.

We therefore face the proposition of doing without a merchant marine or following our previous methods of private development, which has resulted in failure, or obtaining the desired result immediately by Government purchase and ownership. This will mean at least a foundation for an American merchant marine. It does not mean that private capital can not also invest. It has been suggested that private corporations may charter these vessels from the Government at an adequate rate, which would pay sufficient interest and depreciation charges, so as to protect the Government and enable it to yearly add to the fleet through this income.

The idea is not a new one. It is not paternalism. It is a commercial necessity, and will mean much to the future of America's foreign commerce. The value of this plan to the Nation in time of war is incalculable. The Government would have the right to use this merchant fleet as auxiliaries and transports, of which our Navy is much in need. England during the present war has commandeered over twelve hundred merchant vessels out of her fleet of five thousand, and one can readily realize our needs in the event of war with a first-class power, when our entire merchant marine consists of less than a hundred ships.

Independent of any question of the shortage of ships at present; without regard to whether ocean freights are exorbitant or not; even ignoring conditions brought on by or resulting from the war now waging in Europe, the fact is, the consensus of opinion is, and the quite universal conviction is, the United States

needs greatly and, if their interests are considered at all, must have a merchant marine owned, controlled, and operated by this country. This need of ocean carriers under our flag has found expression in the platform pledges of all political parties since 1844. It has been promised the people continuously for over 50 years. The only difference among us has been as to how that should be accomplished. Tonnage taxes, discriminating duties, "free ships," subsidy of mail lines, all have been advocated and all tried.

We find ourselves in greater need and less equipped to-day, comparatively speaking, than at any period in our history. Indeed, at one period we surpassed all other countries in ocean carriers. Private enterprise will not supply the need. Foreign ships handle our foreign commerce. We are solely dependent on them, and without them our rich surplus of agricultural products, manufactures, and goods moving in trade must stop at our wharves. That this is a profitable business, the transporting of our freight and passengers to foreign ports, we have but to refer to the profits, as shown by declared dividends, those lines engaged in it have made. Enough is said when it appears that profit has been sufficient to attract \$100,000,000 of American capital invested in those foreign lines, mainly in the International Mercantile Marine Co. When the Merchant Marine Commission in 1904 inquired whether they would bring their ships under the American flag if a "free-ship" law was favored, they replied they would not. The reason given was that under a foreign flag they had an advantage of cheap labor and, in some cases, of subsidies. We will never decrease wages in this country. The standards of our workmen as to wages and treatment in the shipyards, on the ships, or on the docks we will never consent to lower. Neither will we adopt a policy of subsidizing the ships, although that of itself would be unavailing. Consequently, there is no other alternative but for the Government to intervene in such way as proposed in this bill.

Quite apart, even, from considerations of national defense, we owe it to the people of this country, out of reasonable regard for their welfare and for the prosperity of the Nation, to establish our own means of reaching the market places of the world. Otherwise, foreign ships will dominate our commerce, take such toll as they will, form trusts and combinations to suit themselves, give every advantage to our competitors, keep our goods out of markets to which they could profitably go, by raising freight rates, discriminate against us and in favor of our foreign competitors, destroy our trade by wretched service, delays, charges, hindrances, sorry vessels, irregular sailings, incurring losses for shippers, economizing at our expense, having no regard for the interests of our exporters, prompted by the single purpose of making all they can with as little benefit as possible to us, operating in the interest of manufacturers and merchants and producers of Europe, and making it impossible for us to develop and extend our commerce and business relations in quarters most desirable.

Our self-interest, as well as our self-respect, demands that such a situation shall cease. The short-sighted course, neglect, and prostration of the past must not be perpetuated. American ships are practically unknown in foreign lands. If our products are to continue to leave our shores any great length of time they will have to go with our flag. We have too much at stake in trusting our vast export business to foreign competitors. Every day millions of dollars' worth of our property go into merchantmen which are liable to be sunk by their foes.

Let me quote what Mr. GALLINGER very eloquently said in the Senate January 8, 1906:

FOR BROAD NATIONAL INTERESTS.

The plea of the Merchant Marine Commission, indorsed by the Committee on Commerce of this body, is not primarily for the shipowners or shipbuilders, or even for the seamen of this country, though all of these classes deserve at least as much consideration as is granted by our national laws to any other industrious and patriotic body of American citizens. The need of a large, active, and prosperous merchant fleet is primarily to increase our commerce, next to promote the national defense, and last of all to encourage shipbuilding and navigation. To deny adequate consideration to the merchant marine is to cheat the western or southern farmer of one of the surest hopes of an increased market for the products of his industry. It is to cheat the merchant and manufacturer of an indispensable ally in their fight for trade with their powerful European competitors.

Britain, France, and Germany, all make generous provision by national subvention for conveying not only their mails but their merchandise under their national flags to the distant neutral markets in which they and we are contending for the commercial mastery. Even the smaller powers—Spain, Italy, Austria, Portugal, and last, but not least, Japan—do the same thing. The United States alone leaves its merchants, manufacturers, and farmers at the edge of the ocean to get their goods over seas as best they may—by some accident of trade or the grace of their foreign rivals. If we lag in the world's markets, if we fall behind even in the Philippines, our own possessions, if we see Germany striding ahead of us in the Orient, and all Europe grasping

South America by commercial bonds stronger than the Monroe doctrine, the fault is our own, and in our own hands lies the remedy.

I refresh the Senator's recollection by calling his attention to those splendid remarks.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the Senator from Florida quote that part of a speech I made a good many years ago. I have repeated it a good many times since then, and I presume I may repeat it in the future. I have held to that view—that it was a national disgrace that we had not an adequate merchant marine. I have sounded the alarm, as the Senator has quoted to-day from the report of the Merchant Marine Commission, which I had the honor to write. I called attention to the fact that the time might arrive when we would not have any transportation for the products of our farms and our factories—the very condition that exists to-day.

While I differ very materially from the Senator in the view he takes of this question, I am glad to welcome him to the ranks of those of us who have labored in season and out of season to get some legislation that would benefit the American merchant marine, which has been very strenuously opposed by the Senator from Florida and his party.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the Senator's statements, among which, as I recollect, was the statement that the American people would not establish an American merchant marine through subsidies. If I was correct in my understanding of what the Senator said, I should like to ask him upon what he bases that statement. Is it based upon the action of Congress in the past or is that simply the Senator's opinion as to what the American people really want?

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I want to say, first, to the Senator from New Hampshire that I trust the day is now dawning when he can realize what he has hoped for for these many years.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is a vain hope under this bill.

Mr. FLETCHER. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Utah, I will say that I base that statement upon our experience in the past and upon whatever pronouncement the people of this country have been able to make upon the subject, and at least in view of the fact that they have been unwilling for all these years to adopt any such policy as the granting of a subsidy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, for the last half hour I have been pinching myself to find out whether or not I was really asleep and dreaming. As I have listened to the Senator making his statements to-day, I have been wondering where I had heard them before. It seemed to me that I was back again in the year 1911 and that the Senator from New Hampshire had crossed to the other side of the Chamber and was speaking in the voice of the Senator from Florida.

I fully agree with all that the Senator has said of the necessity of an American merchant marine. I believe in a merchant marine, but I do not believe it will ever be established successfully as provided in this bill. If one is established, I say now that it will cost the American people three or four or five times as much as to pay a direct subsidy to the ships that would be owned by private parties.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I am not going to discuss the question of subsidies to-day; but I have been puzzled all through the years that have intervened since this question was up to be able to satisfy myself as to what a subsidy really is.

Under the statute that will be found now on the books, the ocean mail act of 1891, we are paying to American vessels something over a million dollars a year for the transportation of the mails. I have endeavored to get that amount slightly increased; and had it been slightly increased we would have had vessels in the over-seas trade to-day sufficient to take care of our commerce.

Mr. McAdoo, in a hearing before the House committee to which I shall call attention later on—because it does not amount to anything except that Mr. McAdoo occupied the time—admits that under this bill there will be a large loss to the people of the United States. He frankly says so. He is not sure, he says, that all the lines will be unremunerative, but he knows that most of them will be unremunerative. Now, we

are going to tax the American people for the difference. It is a subsidy, just as much as it would be if we took the money out of the Treasury and established ocean mail lines by aiding private parties in conducting them. I can not for the life of me see the difference between them.

Mr. FLETCHER. In one case, Mr. President, you are simply taxing the American people for the benefit of a few people engaged in a particular business or enterprise. In the other case you are taxing the American people for all the people and all the business of the country—in other words, for themselves.

The question of subsidies is quite a large one and has been extensively discussed in the past. I might mention in that connection, however, that we are now paying \$735,000 a year to one trans-Atlantic line for carrying our mails. We have paid subsidies to a Brazil line. Our experience in that connection has not been encouraging as far as building up a mercantile marine is concerned. We have generously contributed in that direction in the past. As the Senator has said, the act of 1891 provides for this enormous outlay for carrying the mails, far in excess of the actual cost, and it gives the preference to the American vessels over foreign vessels as to all second-class matter and third-class matter. Notwithstanding all we have paid out in that connection, however, we have not approached a solution of the problem of providing ships for doing our foreign trade, and I can see no hope that we can ever attain the object in that way. My claim is that for 50 years we have been unable to enlist sufficient interest on the part of private individuals so that they might build up a merchant marine in the foreign trade, although we have given them all these advantages, and even subsidies, in the past; we have discriminated in favor of them in our laws, particularly with reference to the carrying of mail; and yet we are no further advanced in that direction than we were 50 years ago.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida further yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish only to put in the Record at this point the fact that notwithstanding the subventions, as I call them, we are giving under the ocean mail act of 1891, the Government has an annual profit of over \$2,000,000 in the transportation of our mails; and heretofore I have argued that that profit might well be used to further strengthen our American lines and to give us an over-seas commerce.

Mr. FLETCHER. In this connection it is fair also to say that out of the nearly \$3,000,000 we are now paying for carrying foreign mails more than one-half of it goes to foreign vessels.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly; that is very true.

Mr. FLETCHER. The American vessels are not carrying half of the mails, in spite of the inducements we have offered.

Tonnage of the sailing and steam vessels of the merchant marine of the United States employed in foreign trade in 1887 was, gross tons, 989,412; in 1913, gross tons, 1,019,165, an increase of only 29,753 tons in 26 years, while our foreign commerce has increased by the hundred millions.

TRANSPORTS AND AUXILIARIES.

There is another phase of this question which brings to notice a very important factor to be seriously considered.

Independent of the commercial aspect, we must be impressed with the wisdom of a step like this now proposed for the purpose of providing, reasonably and economically, necessary means of national defense.

The General Board, Navy Department, by Admiral George Dewey, president of the General Board, made a report to the Secretary of the Navy, November 23, 1905, on the subject of "Mail steamships as naval auxiliaries." The General Staff, by Smith S. Leach, lieutenant colonel, General Staff, special committee, made a report to the Secretary of War, William H. Taft, December 22, 1905, on the subject of "The Army's need of merchant steamships as transports in war." These reports appear in Senate Document No. 225, Sixtieth Congress, first session.

So far as I am advised the desirability, if not the public necessity, of providing for the naval auxiliaries and the Army transports pointed out in these reports exists to-day in even fuller measure than when the reports were made.

We may feel like making that provision in a different way from that suggested then, if any specific method may be regarded as favored then, but surely there is no less demand for its being done.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

About one-half the cost of our ocean mail service, amounting to \$3,565,328.89 annually, we pay to foreign ships. To some important countries no American ship ever goes. We are de-

pendent entirely upon foreign ships for our mail, freight, and passenger communications with Brazil and Argentina, two great countries, whose friendly relations we enjoy and with whom we could just as well as not have valuable and extensive commercial relations many times greater than we now have. The exception is the one American line from New York to Brazil.

The same is true with other Republics of South America.

Likewise, from our Atlantic seaboard to the Orient we have no ship carrying mails or freight while foreign ship combines control the traffic entirely.

The fast-mail carriers constitute powerful agencies for trade and valuable factors, especially for the country whose flag they fly.

It is highly important that we extend and improve our ocean mail service, which we can only do by increasing facilities. Notwithstanding we pay \$4 per mile to the European line, under American register, and the preference rates under the law whereby steamers of United States register not under contract receive 80 cents per pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents per pound for other articles, while steamers of foreign register and all sailing vessels receive about 35 cents per pound for letters and post cards and about 4½ cents per pound for other articles, "comparatively few American steamers are available for the dispatch of the mails, and the bulk of the service is performed by foreign steamers."

It is undisputed that American ships in foreign trade are wholly insufficient and inadequate. It ought to be conceded that it is most desirable and important that we increase the number of American merchantmen and train our citizens as officers and seamen to officer and man such ships. We are not willing to attempt this by giving public moneys for the support and maintenance of any private enterprise, even if that would be helpful in accomplishing the restoration of our prestige upon the seas. The grant of a subsidy to some special interest would be a discriminatory invasion of the Treasury the country would strongly disapprove, no matter if it resulted in more American ships, and properly so, on principle. It is admitted that it would be a great consummation to open up mail routes and give a better mail service to certain foreign countries. No one questions that reasonable foresight would dictate more ample provision for Army transports and Navy auxiliaries.

If these things be true, then it is simply a question of how to attain these desirable and, I venture to say, pressing ends.

It is fundamentally wrong and unjust to use the money of all the people in order that a few engaged in a particular business may get more profit.

The remedy, therefore, does not lie in granting subsidies, "subvention," nor "mail pay," nor "free ships," nor yet in "discriminating duties."

We now have laws providing for "free ships" and "discriminating duties," but they have brought but little addition to our foreign shipping facilities and clearly will not suffice to solve the problem, as we have seen.

The occasion has arisen when we are obliged to resort to other means. Circumstances not of our making at all have brought us face to face with the necessity of providing those means.

No country can prosper by living entirely to and within itself. In these days when cables steal out from our shores to the ports of all civilized countries; when communication can be flashed through the air like lightning a distance of 8,000 miles; when even not an unusual financial disturbance in one part of the world will have its effects here; when an earthquake or other disaster across the ocean is known around the world in a few hours; when, for instance, Dewey's achievement in Manila on Sunday morning was known in Washington the Saturday night before; when our surplus of farm produce and of mine and factory is in demand by other peoples, our neighbors, and it is in our power to take them from places where they are comparatively worthless to places where they have much value, we should exercise that power to our present advantage and for our future increasing benefit.

In doing that we bring to our people the things they want, to the advantage of those with whom we make exchange and to our own service; we broaden and widen our friendship by better acquaintance and clearer understandings; at the same time we help to shed the light of civilization and promote mightily the good of humanity.

We have the right and the power to purchase, build, lease, charter, and acquire the ships required to accomplish those ends. We may operate the ships or charter them to others, as may be determined to be best, under such conditions as will protect our people against excessive charges and prevent combines.

We owe it to ourselves to see that our own agents go to all countries wanting our goods, who will serve our interests rather than the interests of our competitors into whose hands we have hitherto intrusted our exports. The time has arrived for positive, definite, energetic action by the Government itself on behalf of all the people. This action should be prompt and effectual. The situation brooks of no delay. From all portions of the country and from all classes of our people the call is for immediate action by the Government. From every industry and every enterprise the call comes. From every individual who desires the prosperity of the country and the welfare of its citizens, the call is made. I believe there is patriotism enough, wisdom sufficient, and statesmanship ample to answer that call.

Mr. President, I desire, without reading, to attach to and make a part of my remarks a few letters and clippings which I have received.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, permission will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Chamber of Commerce, successor to Pensacola Commercial Association.]
PENSACOLA, FLA., December 19, 1914.

Senator D. U. FLETCHER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Last night I talked with the president of the Pensacola Tar & Turpentine Co., a corporation which produces turpentine, tar, pitch, and various by-products. "We have several thousand barrels of tar on our yards," he said. "We can sell every barrel at a good price in England and on the Continent. The ship brokers will offer us no space, and promise us none definitely. The last turpentine we shipped cost \$4 a barrel to deliver in England. This is 8 cents a gallon, four times the normal rate. For the last tar shipped to England we paid \$1.50 a barrel freight, deck load, and took our own risk, as the insurance asked was about 15 per cent. We know by heart now the cable-code words that mean 'Can not quote,' 'Unable to get ships.'"

The freight situation has almost killed the export lumber and timber business to England and Europe, the principal markets. The merchants have inquiries and could get business if they could get bottoms to carry it. If they are lucky enough to get a ship, they must pay double or triple freight and 1½ to 2 per cent extra war-risk insurance. They must prepay the freight also.

Ships can be had for cotton and grain, but at three and four times the normal rate. A ship broker told me yesterday he was asked \$3.25 a hundredweight freight to Germany. Rates are, by far, the highest known in the experience of ship brokers here.

The remedy for this situation is more neutral ships. Two conditions are the cause of our present European ocean-freight ills:

Decrease in number of vessels available—estimated at 30 to 40 per cent.

Uncertainty as to maintenance of the present supply, which may be reduced by destruction of vessels or their withdrawal from the uses of commerce for war purposes.

More ships would help remedy the first condition; neutral ships the second.

Very truly, yours,

C. E. DOBSON, President.

NORTH AND SOUTH AMERICAN TRADING CO.,
Louisville, Ky., December 16, 1914.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: My not replying before this day to your esteemed letter of the 27th of November is due to my absence from Louisville.

I wish to thank you for the pamphlets which you have also sent me.

If you refer to the printed testimony given before the Merchant Marine Committee in the investigation of the foreign ship trust, you will find much information.

I appeared before said committee on January 7, 1913. Mr. Lowry, of the Pan American Mail—the New Orleans line—also testified at some length, giving much valuable information along practical and technical lines.

The sworn testimony of shippers and shipping experts before the Alexander committee indisputably proves that a conspiracy existed on the part of foreign shipping combinations to control America's over-sea commerce, so as to wring annual tribute from it and to checkmate the too ambitious efforts of the United States in expanding her foreign commerce.

The hearings before the committee show that there existed not a single American ship under the Stars and Stripes in the carrying trade between the United States, Brazil, and Argentina, and that all other lines known as American lines—operating ships under foreign flags—had certain routes allotted to them in the trade with the west coast of South and Central America.

These so-called American lines were members of the so-called conference lines, and all dominated by the foreign shipping trust, whose headquarters were London and Germany.

The investigation showed that the tariffs or freight rates from United States ports to foreign marts, notably to those of South America, were dictated from Europe, and were made so as to conserve the bulk of the flow of commerce from South America to Europe and vice versa.

The dividends declared by these foreign lines are sufficient denials of the statements that the American lines can't compete with European lines on a legitimate basis.

All that American lines need is protection against rebating and combinations or monopolies aimed at driving independent American lines off the seas.

To expand our commerce legitimately and to maintain and protect it, we need American lines under the American flag, operated by Americans, and protected by America.

I am inclosing copies of letters which treat of this subject, which I think point out the disadvantages under which our Nation labors and suggest the things we must do to emancipate ourselves from English and European economic domination.

I note that foreign sinister influences are still at work trying to obstruct and defeat the measures now before Congress that would aid in the upbuilding of our merchant shipping. The fact that America might again resume her former place among the nations as a maritime

power and carry her own trade is of greater concern to the nations of Europe—England, especially—than the present European struggle.

Europe's war might be over in a year or two and these European nations will then turn loose their shipping to resume the ocean trade routes and reconquer the markets that they temporarily lost, but an American merchant marine would be an obstacle to their ambitions.

Hoping to have the honor of again hearing from you, I beg to remain,

Very respectfully,

SIDNEY STORY.

[From the New York Press, December 19, 1914.]

OUR SHIPPING FOLLY.

On how slender a thread hangs to-day the foreign commerce of this country, though we are at peace with all the world, though we are abundantly supplied with surplus products that all the peoples of the earth, those at peace and those at war, need and ask for, may be appreciated by anybody who reflects upon the possibilities suggested by the raid of the flying squadron of German cruisers against the Yorkshire coast.

Not that anything like that could imperil the safety of, or even do more than negligible damage to, Great Britain. Not that such a thing could hasten or retard the end of the war in favor of one side or the other.

It is not that the German cruisers came flying out against the Yorkshire coast, but that they came out with all the seas before them.

We are doing a vast export business. For the most part our many cargoes of products are going out in English bottoms. Almost between the rising and the setting of the sun of every day we are selling abroad by the tens of millions, and we are making profits by the millions. And almost all of this depends upon the British merchantmen that are free to carry our cargoes over all the waters of the earth so long as German battleships, cruisers, and commerce destroyers are not ranging those waters in fleets, as the solitary *Emden* ranged in the East to the terror of merchant shipping, and as the *Karlsruhe* has similarly ranged in the South Atlantic waters of the West.

A score of *Emdens* scattered over the seas might all be doomed to be run down sooner or later, but in the meanwhile they might very well sweep the oceans clear of the British merchant marine, as England's war fleet have swept the oceans clear of Germany's merchant marine.

And that would be the end of our foreign commerce. We should have the wheat, the corn, the cotton, the thousand and one supplies now going out every day in heavily freighted ships; the peoples of the world, neutrals and belligerents, would be begging for our neutral products, but we could not ship them, for, though a neutral nation, we should lack neutral ships.

Neutral commerce is helpless to transport itself in anything but neutral ships if sea powers at war against each other can both maintain fleets on the high seas.

We ought to have our own neutral ships, just as we have our own neutral articles of commerce, and then all the fleets of commerce of all the belligerents might vanish off the seas, and we could trade with no hindrance. Not only could we sail our commerce into the ports of neutrals, but when there was no contraband goods in the cargoes we could sail them past the forts and under the guns into all the ports of all the powers at war.

And we, aiming to be the greatest trading Nation on earth, to all intents and purposes, haven't a ship. This is an economic folly, a national shame.

[From the New York Press, December 19, 1914.]

FARMERS LOSE THROUGH DISCRIMINATION BY BIG STEAMSHIP INTERESTS—FAILURE OF GOVERNMENT TO ENCOURAGE MERCHANT MARINE FACTOR AGAINST EXPORTERS, SAYS W. N. WHITE.

American farmers and exporters are losing millions of dollars as a direct result of discrimination against this country by steamship interests. That, in substance, is the assertion made to Congress and other branches and departments of the Government by W. N. White, of W. N. White & Co., of this city. Discrimination is made possible by the failure of the United States Government to encourage the American merchant marine.

This year's crop of apples should realize for the growers about \$250,000,000, White estimates. "It will not pay them \$50,000,000, and unless something is done soon 650,000 acres of orchards in the far West will be put out of business."

Thousands of growers who set out from 10 to 20 acre orchards of apples, believing that would enable them and their families to have a competency for life, will be ruined, and not only lose their savings but their homes as well.

Similar losses will be suffered by growers of other fruits. Discrimination, White says, takes the form of high ocean freight rates. Comparisons of rates were submitted to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives.

EXTORTIONATE RATES.

The chairman of that committee, JOSHUA W. ALEXANDER, refers to the ocean freight rates now being charged to ports in Europe as "extortionate."

"If you wish to ship oranges to Europe," White explains, "the ocean freight rate is 50 cents a box. The same sized box of oranges can be shipped from Jaffa, by way of Alexandria, Egypt, to Liverpool for 42 cents. That voyage ordinarily requires 23 days. The rate from Spain to Liverpool is only 18 cents a box."

"The rate for apples to Norway and Sweden—a trip of about 12 days—is \$1.50 and \$2 a barrel. To South America—a trip of 23 days—the rate is \$4.25 a barrel."

"It costs \$1.10 a box to send apples from New York to South America, the time required being from 21 to 25 days. On the other hand, freight charges on box apples from Tasmania to England—time in transit, 42 days—is 66 cents, and the same rate is charged from Australia to England—time, 35 days."

"The reason those rates are so much cheaper than ours is they have plenty of ships."

"The Furness Line, from Montreal to South Africa—35 days' run—charges 72 cents a box and \$2.38 a barrel. Those vessels are subsidized by the Canadian Government. There are no steamships direct from the United States to South Africa. The American must ship first to England and then transship to South Africa, which costs more than double the freight charged from Montreal."

From these and other illustrations White concludes that this country can not hope to extend its commerce properly without the aid of a large American merchant marine.

SURPLUS FOR EUROPE.

"Plenty of people in America say we will send our surplus to Europe. 'They must have it.' They might take the surplus if the rate of freight were the same as charged from other ports, and the freight would be the same were it not for the steamship combination."

"The steamship agents here say the freight rates are fixed in Europe, but that is a subterfuge. It is a well-known fact that the agents for various companies meet in the Produce Exchange in New York between the hours of 1 and 3 p. m. and there compare their offerings and bookings made for steamers a week in advance. If their ships are well laden, no reductions in freight rates are made, and if they have demands for more space than they can supply they increase the rates."

Millions of dollars of products are being wasted to-day because of inability of farmers to reach foreign markets. In Florida, for instance, many owners of orchards are permitting the fruits to rot on the trees because they can see no profit in trying to sell them.

White says there are 8,000,000 boxes of oranges in Florida and almost 18,000,000 boxes in California. When the season commenced recently Florida oranges were selling at an average of \$1.50 a box gross. From that must be deducted 56 cents freight, 15 cents for the box, 13 cents for paper and packing, and about 13 cents more for cost of picking and hauling to the warehouse.

"After Christmas plenty of oranges will be sold for freight and expenses alone."

With adequate shipping facilities and consequent lower ocean freight rates the surplus fruit could be shipped profitably to European, South African, and South American markets.

CHANCE FOR ONIONS.

"This year there is a large crop of onions in the United States," says White, "and with reasonable freight rates quite a quantity could be exported to England and Scotland. The first shipments that were sent paid 30 shillings a ton freight. Now the rate is 40 shillings."

"Every year quantities of onions are shipped here from Egypt on through bills of lading, and the freight charge on these shipments is only 30 shillings a ton. The time of passage from Egypt to Liverpool is 16 days, and from Liverpool to New York 10 days, which includes the time consumed in unloading and reloading on the Liverpool piers."

"The rate from Liverpool to New York is 20 shillings, but to ship the same goods from New York to Liverpool the charge is 40 shillings. The consequence of this unjust rate is that onions must be sacrificed."

"I can not think that the Ship Trust owns America. To fail to encourage an American merchant marine is to encourage the Ship Trust. If the Canadian Government can afford subsidies at the rate of more than \$2,000,000 in a year in order to protect its farmers, surely the United States should increase its shipping facilities by subsidies or in some other way. Otherwise, thousands of acres of land will cease to be cultivated."

[From the Washington Times, December 26, 1914.]

HIGH SHIPPING RATES.

The first cargo of cotton to leave an American port direct for Germany since the war opened put out from Galveston yesterday, consisting of 6,500 bales, going to Bremen. Under the agreement reached a few weeks ago it will go without opposition or blockade right into its port through the British fleet, for cotton is not contraband when carried in neutral bottoms.

Entirely aside from the importance of resuming the export of cotton to Germany interest attaches to this shipment because of the freight rate on it. The owners of the cotton will pay, despite that it is not a war risk, \$3 per 100 pounds, whereas a year ago the charge would have been just about 10 per cent of that rate.

The reason is said to be the scarcity of shipping to handle the business of the world. The German merchant marine has been driven off the seas, and it was highly important as a transportation factor. Many ships have been captured and destroyed. Probably a very much larger number yet have been commandeered for service as transports, auxiliaries of all kinds, colliers, and the like.

Yet all this can hardly justify such a huge advance in ocean freights as is being demanded. Back of all the war-time conditions there is the fact that absolutely no stability governs ocean carriage charges. Rates run all the way from zero—the carriage of heavy cargo free in order to get its use as ballast—to figures which even in normal times are often excessive. The whole subject has been the theme of numerous complaints and is now under investigation by the Treasury Department. David Lubin, American delegate to the International Institute of Agriculture at Rome, made a detailed and most impressive statement of these conditions to a congressional committee a few months ago. The Senate has called for information from the administrative departments of the Government, and it appears there is hope for some effective measures to better conditions.

The measures are needed. Whether or no, the Government will find itself landed right in the business of building or buying ships, and perhaps operating them on Government account for commercial purposes, unless some measure of order can be brought out of the chaos of water-transportation conditions.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, December 22, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 21st instant, you are informed as follows:

The reason why more is paid to foreign steamers than to American steamers for the conveyance of the mails is that comparatively few American steamers are available for the dispatch of the mails, and that the bulk of the service is performed by foreign steamers. For instance, during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, 979,002 pounds of letters and post cards and 7,827,593 pounds of other articles were dispatched by American steamers, and 2,554,066 pounds of letters and post cards and 14,014,849 pounds of other articles were dispatched by foreign steamers.

The only steamship lines under formal contract with the department for the conveyance of mails to foreign countries are those operating under the act of March 3, 1891. These lines are paid on the basis of the distance traveled on the outward trips, and are as follows: Red D Line, from New York to Venezuela via Porto Rico and Curacao, once every two weeks in vessels of the third class, compensation \$1 a mile. Red D Line, from New York to Venezuela via Porto Rico and Curacao, once every two weeks in vessels of the fourth class, compensation 66½ cents a mile. New York & Cuba Mail Steamship Co., from

New York to Vera Cruz, Mexico, via Havana and Progreso, once a week in vessels of the third class, compensation \$1 a mile. The International Mercantile Marine Co., from New York to Southampton via Plymouth and Cherbourg, once a week in vessels of the first class, compensation \$4 a mile. Oceanic Steamship Co., from San Francisco to Sydney, Australia, via Honolulu and Pago Pago, once every four weeks in vessels of the second class, compensation \$2 a mile.

Steamers other than those operating under the act of 1891 are compensated on the basis of the actual weights of the mails conveyed, the rates at present allowed being 80 cents a pound for letters and post cards and 8 cents a pound for other articles to steamers of American register, and 4 francs a kilogram (about 35 cents a pound) for letters and post cards and 50 centimes a kilogram (about 4½ cents a pound) for other articles to steamers of foreign register.

The tables on pages 103 to 106, inclusive, of the report of this office for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1914, show in detail the name of each line used for the conveyance of the mails for that year, the weight of the mails conveyed by each line, and the amount of the compensation paid to each line. Said tables indicate also whether the steamers of each line are of American or foreign register.

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, December 18, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SIR: Referring to your request by telephone to be furnished with the amounts paid to American steamers and foreign steamers, respectively, for the conveyance of United States mails to foreign countries for each fiscal year from 1909 to 1914, inclusive, I have the honor to furnish below a statement in confirmation of the data furnished to you by the superintendent of foreign mails early this afternoon by telephone.

Amount paid.

	American steamers.	Foreign steamers.
Fiscal year ended June 30—		
1909.....	\$1,354,996.18	\$919,075.62
1910.....	1,359,513.21	1,015,696.44
1911.....	1,321,418.81	1,140,455.46
1912.....	1,289,787.70	1,295,231.49
1913.....	1,453,212.18	1,325,344.21
1914.....	1,409,483.77	1,429,434.25

Yours, very truly,

JOSEPH STEWART,
Second Assistant Postmaster General.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 29, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Replying to your letter of the 26th instant, quoting a statement in Senate Document 425, Sixty-first Congress, second session, and your inquiries based on that document, I call your attention to the following facts:

1. From 1893 until September, 1913, no American steamships were running regularly between ports of the United States and Brazil, but about September, 1913, the United States & Brazil Steamship Line was organized, making use of ships of the American-Hawaiian Steamship Co., with sailings of about once a month or once in three weeks from New York to Rio de Janeiro and other Brazilian ports. I inclose an advertisement of the line from the New York Journal of Commerce of December 28. Since the passage of the ship registry act of August 18, 1914, a number of steamers have taken out American registers for South American trade, principally ships owned by the United States Steel Products Co.

2. From 1893 up to date, so far as I am aware, there has been no regular American steamship service to Argentina.

3. The American people have been dependent on foreign steamships for their mail, freight, and passenger communications with Brazil and Argentina. This condition continued from 1893 to date, except as indicated above.

4. The following steamers ply regularly between our Pacific seaboard and the Orient:

	Gross tons.
Minnesota.....	20,718
Manchuria.....	13,639
Mongolia.....	13,639
Siberia.....	11,284
Korea.....	11,276
China.....	5,060

(NOTE.—Army transports, of course, do a considerable Government business between Pacific coast ports and Honolulu and the Philippines.)

5. I know of no American steamships plying regularly between our Atlantic seaboard and the Orient.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, December 30, 1914.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In compliance with your request of December 21, I take pleasure in inclosing herewith a statement showing the exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil during the last three fiscal years ending June 30, 1912 to 1914, inclusive.

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM C. REDFIELD, Secretary.

Exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil during the last three fiscal years ending June 30, 1912 to 1914, inclusive.

Articles.	Quantities.		Values.		1914	
	1912	1913	1912	1913	Quantities.	Values.
Domestic exports:						
Agricultural implements, and parts of.....			\$426,124	\$324,823		\$231,698
Blacking.....			31,464	38,502		25,235
Breadstuffs—						
Wheat flour..... barrels..	625,399	583,418	3,277,981	3,105,239	748,612	3,752,105
All other.....			75,916	48,161		34,333
Cars, carriages, other vehicles, and parts of—						
Automobiles..... number..	554	1,023	662,883	1,110,320	312	285,441
Cars, passenger and freight.....			1,243,293	3,754,065		793,604
Cycles and motor cycles, and parts of.....			17,596	32,191		26,092
All other.....			135,596	339,579		225,745
Chemicals, drugs, dyes, and medicines—						
Medicines, patent or proprietary.....			387,554	404,344		248,617
All other.....			251,949	184,633		141,510
Clocks and watches, and parts of.....			124,611	120,025		66,015
Coal—bituminous..... tons..	307,125	234,368	1,025,646	727,341	239,082	766,824
Copper, manufactures of.....			405,223	410,784		133,110
Cotton, manufactures of—						
Cloths—						
Bleached and unbleached..... yards..	384,799	307,559	50,981	54,747	162,132	35,849
Colored..... yards..	889,195	828,183	66,844	65,300	404,904	36,556
All other.....			190,887	266,321		156,857
Dental goods.....			159,815	228,422		174,550
Electrical machinery, appliances, and instruments.....			3,252,666	3,040,465		2,204,763
Explosives—						
Cartridges.....			371,771	477,349		287,600
All other.....			30,523	10,019		18,561
Fibers, vegetable, and textile grasses, manufactures of—						
Twine.....			54,959	82,440		60,634
All other.....			31,520	36,091		32,923
Fish—						
Salmon, canned..... pounds..	151,717	219,492	17,348	22,820	80,129	7,211
Shellfish.....			72,060	91,943		43,762
All other.....			73,958	129,715		54,308
Fruits and nuts.....			163,990	163,134		348,360
Glass and glassware.....			93,317	93,591		70,492
Gold and silver, manufactures of, including jewelry.....			57,561	41,487		26,634
India rubber, manufactures of.....			199,239	251,290		119,272
Instruments and apparatus for scientific purposes.....			103,661	111,385		57,057
Iron and steel, and manufactures of—						
Builders' hardware.....			247,553	236,427		173,808
Cutlery.....			98,798	108,309		85,329
Firearms.....			515,323	587,933		362,647
Machinery, machines, and parts of—						
Cash registers..... number..	1,246	2,627	188,574	364,644	1,153	150,267
Engines, and parts of—						
Locomotives..... number..	92	211	1,251,824	2,317,853	66	637,528
All other, and parts of.....			440,490	523,949		344,019
Metal-working machinery.....			231,422	346,187		115,974
Mining machinery.....			236,128	285,119		111,693
Printing presses.....			17,607	100,186		38,201
Sewing machines.....			1,011,264	1,677,141		1,611,510
Typewriting machines.....			312,638	351,640		125,598
Woodworking machinery.....			116,761	120,896		34,120
All other machinery, and parts of.....			1,205,027	1,444,026		1,100,157
Nails and spikes..... lbs..	2,762,550	2,257,350	65,852	58,492	1,330,278	38,158
Pipes and fittings..... lbs..	8,229,676	9,637,859	243,374	374,455	4,239,556	144,135
Rails for railways, of steel..... tons..	40,730	31,629	1,187,462	1,031,884	45,367	1,529,309
Tools, n. e. s.....			620,361	938,001		541,005
Structural iron and steel..... tons..	3,958	9,610	246,763	467,922	2,780	163,641
Wire..... lbs..	32,824,320	37,095,991	825,264	902,327	28,375,955	648,180
All other iron and steel.....			1,729,350	1,564,633		1,033,105
Lamps, chandeliers, etc. (except electric).....			73,873	59,500		43,107
Leather and tanned skins, and manufactures of—						
Leather and tanned skins—						
Upper.....			483,336	651,024		357,943
All other.....			99,744	246,249		186,218
Manufactures of—						
Boots and shoes..... pairs..	85,342	160,267	234,817	485,608	143,497	451,628
All other.....			27,647	22,888		12,207
Meat and dairy products—						
Bacon..... lbs..	958,879	1,150,561	122,995	169,128	870,390	130,502
Pork, pickled..... lbs..	168,415	3,489	16,635	482		
Lard..... lbs..	601,349	603,537	73,854	79,837	651,963	86,377
Butter..... lbs..	598	241	120	47		
All other.....			44,451	33,210		12,491
Naval stores—						
Rosin..... barrels..	176,964	180,701	1,165,573	1,212,539	97,658	673,687
Turpentine, spirits of..... gallons..	334,240	356,652	188,503	176,324	301,912	154,288
Oils—						
Animal—						
Lard..... gallons..	3,411	2,610	2,832	2,376	2,315	2,216
All other..... gallons..	1,030	498	962	249	200	203
Mineral, refined—						
Illuminating..... gallons..	37,491,101	32,828,176	3,092,334	2,837,707	32,275,552	3,231,668
Lubricating..... gallons..	2,740,496	3,403,672	530,217	723,586	3,181,624	659,352
All other..... gallons..	5,137,719	8,518,771	718,626	1,376,207	8,056,074	1,367,943
Vegetable—						
Cottonseed..... pounds..	3,016,045	3,500,660	192,500	239,275	2,566,670	191,781
All other.....			2,868	4,929		6,502
Paints, pigments, colors, and varnishes.....			149,397	240,074		126,019
Paper, and manufactures of—						
Books, maps, engravings, etc.....			166,584	280,304		227,866
Printing paper..... pounds..	126,306	346,898	6,511	11,735	326,335	10,071
All other.....			82,657	86,391		77,927
Paraffin and paraffin wax.....			8,640	11,939	555,663	18,498
Perfumes, cosmetics, and all toilet preparations.....			17,779	21,392		15,818
Plated ware.....			25,123	46,215		24,910
Silk, manufactures of.....			15,957	7,927		6,502
Soap.....			36,757	49,754		41,050
Spirits, etc.—Malt liquors.....			12	396		331
Vegetables.....			53,796	40,302		42,306

Exports of the principal articles from the United States to Brazil, etc.—Continued.

Articles.	Quantities.		Values.		1914	
	1912	1913	1912	1913	Quantities.	Values.
Domestic exports—Continued.						
Wood, manufactures of—						
Timber, sawed.....M feet..	747	853	\$17,485	\$18,755	331	\$7,565
Lumber.....M feet..	59,643	69,823	1,248,665	1,564,141	38,023	913,982
Boards, planks, deals, joists, and scantling.....M feet..			27,226	75,069		12,682
All other.....			148,395	112,274		138,106
Furniture.....			77,644	65,350		34,095
All other manufactures of.....			1,380,394	2,020,721		1,123,100
All other articles.....						
Total domestic exports.....			34,587,050	42,542,424		29,843,018
Total foreign exports.....			91,031	96,043		120,896
Total exports of merchandise.....			34,678,081	42,638,467		29,963,914

[From the Washington Post, Thursday, December 24, 1914.]

THE SHIPPING SITUATION.

The shipping interests of the United States—the builders and operators of steamships—are paralyzed on account of the uncertainty that hangs over their business. They do not know whether or not the Government is to enter the field as their competitor. They do not know whether or not foreign-built ships will be permitted to enter the coastwise trade. They do not know whether or not the Government will protect them against unjustified aggression by belligerents.

Ocean freight rates have jumped skyward since the beginning of the war. German and Austrian vessels have been laid up; British vessels have been largely commandeered by the Government; Italian vessels are engaged in Government service; French vessels are almost wholly employed by the French Government. Hence the world's neutral commerce, and much of the commerce with belligerents, is carried on with a shortage of ships just at a moment when the demand for supplies is most urgent. Vessels are earning five times as much as before the war, and even when the war is ended the prospect is good for an enormous ocean commerce on account of the destruction and consumption of foodstuffs and supplies of all kinds.

Is it to be supposed that Americans are not wide awake to this opportunity? The shipping men and shipbuilders are not asleep. They would build ships and put them into this immensely profitable business if they knew they were safe. But they dare not order vessels to be constructed in American shipyards if cheaper foreign ships are to be admitted into the coastwise trade. They dare not build ships for the foreign trade while they are threatened with the competition of the Government itself. The best they can do is to meet the huge demands of Europe by chartering foreign vessels and sending them out with American cargoes. They are doing a big business and making a lot of money, but the traffic is not bringing about the construction of a single vessel in American yards.

One of the most urgent questions before Congress is the Government shipping bill. It needs quick and thorough discussion. If it is a good plan it should be put through without delay. If it is unwise it should be promptly rejected in order that individual American enterprise may go ahead and build ships.

[From the Florida Times-Union, December 31, 1914.]

USING GERMANY'S EXCUSE.

As a rule the London papers whose opinions of the Wilson note have been quoted by the Associated Press do not claim that Great Britain has been acting within her rights in interfering with American shipping on the high seas, but justify it on the ground of necessity. On precisely the same ground Germany justified her invasion of Belgium. She promised to go through Belgium with as little damage as possible and pay the proper indemnity, just as Great Britain promises to hold American vessels as short a time as possible and pay the proper indemnity. But Belgium as a neutral refused to listen to the German plea of necessity. She would have ceased to be neutral if she had listened, and we should refuse to listen to the British plea of necessity. If we surrender our rights in order that Great Britain and her allies may be able to whip Germany and Austria, our neutrality is a sham. If we are neutral, we are not concerned with Great Britain's necessities. Individuals in this country sympathize with the allies and others with the two Teutonic nations, but the United States as a Nation does not give a continental which side whips. That is what neutrality means. But the United States as a Nation falls contemptibly short of its duty if it does not protect its citizens in their rights, and the fact that it has not done so has already cost the South alone hundreds of millions of dollars, not in the cargoes seized, but because the fear of seizure has paralyzed our commerce.

This damage will never be paid. Great Britain may pay damages amounting to a million or two dollars for the detention of ships, and in some cases to the confiscation of cargoes, but the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of products that Europe would take from us at a good price if we would deliver them and that have been withheld through fear of capture by the British—this inflicts enormous damage for which payment will not be made.

If Americans are scared away from shipping cotton to Germany throughout the war, this of itself would reduce or rather has reduced the price at least \$10 per bale—a loss to American growers of \$160,000,000, and a gain to British spinners of \$50,000,000 on the 5,000,000 bales they buy. It is announced that cotton is not contraband, but it is also known that ships containing noncontraband cargoes have been seized, detained, and searched for contraband. This is a thing that our Government should not tolerate, and not one other American ship would be seized if it were known that our Government would not tolerate it.

GREAT BRITAIN HAS LOST SHIPS WORTH \$11,400,000—54 VESSELS WITH CARGOES VALUED AT \$18,800,000 CAPTURED OR DESTROYED BY THE ENEMY.

LONDON, December 18.

During the first four months of the war 54 British foreign-going ships, valued at \$11,400,000, with cargoes worth \$18,800,000, were cap-

tured or destroyed by the enemy. These are the official figures of the Liverpool and London War Risks Insurance Association.

According to these figures the losses for four months were 1.23 per cent of the total number of vessels, 1.49 per cent of their total value, and 0.94 per cent of the total value of cargoes carried.

This would indicate that vessels could have been insured at a rate of 0.37 per cent monthly, and their cargoes at a rate of 0.94. The rates fixed by the Government at the beginning of the war were 0.72 for vessels and 1.24 for cargoes. This shows a snug margin of profit for underwriters.

STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN, December 18.

Total losses to Scandinavian shipping through mine disasters were as follows up to mid-December:

Sweden, 8 ships and 60 lives; Denmark, 6 vessels and 6 lives; Norway, 5 vessels and 6 lives. To this total must also be added Holland, with 3 vessels and 15 lives. The total financial loss for the 22 ships and their cargoes will reach nearly \$10,000,000.

328 SANFORD AVENUE,
Flushing, N. Y., December 31, 1914.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My father, brother, and myself having been large owners in, and practical and successful managers of, United States sailing seagoing ships half a century ago, I am naturally much interested in the condition, suddenly discovered by our Congressmen, that we have very few strictly United States seagoing vessels.

For 10 years past I have written letters to our several Presidents explaining how, in the nature of things, there can be no revival of what our "rocking-chair sailors" please to call the "merchant marine."

From early times until, say, 1865, United States seagoing vessels were built in the United States of wood and propelled by canvas. When iron steam-propelled vessels gradually came into use, wooden sailing vessels went out, and will never be revived. In early days our seagoing vessels were of small tonnage; the crews were mostly United States citizens; and the captain was usually a part owner of the vessel under his command.

This has all been superseded by gigantic steam vessels owned by powerful foreign corporations, utterly inefficient seamen, as in the *Titanic* case, and the captains, largely of foreign birth, having no personal ownership in the vessel, merely hired to run the vessel as quickly as possible from one port to another, just as with the engine driver on a railroad train.

Millions of foreign capital is invested in our trans-Atlantic steam lines, and the excessive cost of a first-class steel ocean steamer built in this country offers no attraction to domestic capital.

Young men, members of well-to-do families, often "went to sea," something now unheard of except in naval circles. Appreciating from sad experience the foregoing conditions, I have proposed to Washington officials a practical method for securing at once a number of seagoing steam vessels to serve two purposes, viz, as colliers, absolutely necessary if our present or enlarged Navy is to be of any value; secondly, these vessels, say, of 10,000 tons each with a speed of 15 knots, to be plainly fitted for passengers and freight, and to be chartered to established, responsible United States firms engaged in shipping. Charters to provide for the return of the vessels when needed for Government service. Charterers to keep vessels and machinery in order at their own expense, and to maintain on each vessel, free of expense to the United States, a United States naval and engineer officer with full access at all times to all parts of vessels.

The charter money should more than pay interest on amount invested in vessels, and if eventually sold to charterers or other United States citizens, proceeds could be used in building other similar vessels. By this means lines could be established through the Panama Canal to South American ports by capable shipping merchants, who would not have enough available capital to build such vessels, and eventually, if profitable, private capital would be invested. Heretofore large amounts of the public money has been used in aid of railroads, irrigation, and sundry agricultural requirements, but none, as I can remember, for increase of United States shipping, although the United States has an immense extent of available seacoast with safe harbors. In my time the Swedes, French, Italians, and Germans have gradually but thoroughly supplanted us in ocean transportation.

If the foregoing suggestion does not meet approval, then the only hope for recovering our seagoing ascendancy is to abrogate all sumptuary maritime laws and allow our citizens to purchase vessels wherever built, with all the advantages given to vessels built in United States. Citizens of all other maritime nations have this privilege.

Silver-tongued orators armed with statistics may claim that we can build and operate first-class vessels in this country as cheaply as any other nation, but I and hundreds of other men educated as shipping merchants, but obliged to sell out and find other occupations, are living (or dead) refutations of this claim.

Trusting that your efforts to restore our ocean trade may be successful, and wishing you success in the new year, I remain,
Yours, truly,

ALFRED NELSON.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Florida if he will not consent to have the bill laid aside temporarily in order to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill? I ask unanimous consent to do that.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am willing to have that done, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 20241, known as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not hear the request of the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have requested unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I suggest the absence of a quorum. There are Senators absent who are interested in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire suggests the absence of a quorum. Let the Secretary call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Lippitt	Sheppard
Bankhead	Gallinger	Lodge	Shively
Borah	Gore	Martine, N. J.	Simmons
Bryan	Gronna	Oliver	Smith, S. C.
Camden	Hardwick	Overman	Smoot
Chamberlain	Johnson	Page	Thornton
Clapp	Jones	Perkins	Vardaman
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Ransdell	White
	Lane	Shafroth	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thirty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is not present. The Secretary will call the roll of the absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. STERLING, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WORKS answered to their names when called.

Mr. OLIVER. My colleague [Mr. PENROSE] is absent from the Senate to-day on account of illness.

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. LA FOLLETTE, Mr. MYERS, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. STONE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I understand unanimous consent has been given to take up the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unanimous consent has been given to lay aside the shipping bill. Unanimous consent has not been given to take up the urgent deficiency bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Then I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up House bill 20241, known as the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill indicated by him. Is there objection?

Mr. LODGE. I object, Mr. President. Let the bill be taken up on motion.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move to take up House bill 20241.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 20241) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1915 and prior years, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the committee amendments will be considered first. The Chair hears no objection. The Secretary will proceed to read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Treasury Department," subhead "Collecting internal revenue," on page 2, line 22, after the date "1915,"

to strike out "\$75,000" and insert "\$180,000," so as to make the clause read:

For salaries and expenses of collectors of internal revenue, including the same objects specified under this head in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, \$180,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "District of Columbia," on page 3, after line 13, to insert:

Improving Fourteenth Street: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to increase the width of roadway of Fourteenth Street NW., between F Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, to 70 feet, and to replace the present granite block pavement on said roadway with asphalt or asphalt block, chargeable to the appropriation for "Repairs to streets, avenues, and alleys," for the fiscal year 1915.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT.

For transportation of the Army and its supplies, including the same objects specified under this head in the Army appropriation act for the fiscal year 1914, \$554,371.24.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paragraph may go over for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Unless there is objection, the request of the Senator from Utah will be granted. The Chair hears none.

The reading was continued.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Department of Agriculture," subhead "Bureau of Plant Industry," on page 5, line 22, after the word "means," to strike out "in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and," so as to make the clause read:

For the emergency caused by the infectious nature and continued spread of the destructive disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease, and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as may in his judgment be necessary, \$35,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to pay such expense and employ such persons and means to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers, or individuals as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my attention was just called to this amendment. I will say to the Senator from North Carolina I do not believe the amendment is in the shape intended by the committee. I call his attention to the fact that if the amendment is adopted as proposed now, it will be impossible to employ persons or means either in the city of Washington or elsewhere. The amendment ought to read:

To pay such expense and employ such persons and means elsewhere than at the city of Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what the law is. I understand the words "in the city of Washington" were put in in order that they might establish a bureau in the city of Washington. So if we do not include those words they are bound to use the fund outside the city of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not quite catch my meaning. I am in full sympathy with the Senator in striking out the words "in the city of Washington," because I do not believe persons affected by this appropriation ought to be employed in this city, but we go further in the amendment and strike out the words "and elsewhere," so that if all the words proposed are stricken out persons can not be employed in the city of Washington or elsewhere.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from Utah allow me a moment? If you strike out the words as proposed by the committee the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to employ these persons and spend the money anywhere he pleases. It becomes perfectly general then.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me it leaves it perfectly general. When the words "in the city of Washington and elsewhere" are stricken out it does not necessarily exclude the employment elsewhere, but it strikes out the word "elsewhere" in the connection where the words "the city of Washington" are used.

Mr. SMOOT. As I understood the committee, it wanted to limit the expenditure of the appropriation to places other than the city of Washington.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That was the voice of the committee. I have no doubt about that; and this language does that very thing. It gives the discretion to the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such persons and means elsewhere and to cooperate with the authorities of the States concerned.

Mr. LODGE. That would not prevent him from using them in the city of Washington.

Mr. SMOOT. The whole appropriation could be used in the city of Washington.

Mr. LODGE. It would leave his power perfectly unlimited.

Mr. OVERMAN. The act of 1882 required the city of Washington to be specified for employment here.

Mr. LODGE. If I may make a suggestion, if you want to make it safe to obtain your purpose, you should say "and employ such persons and means except in the city of Washington."

Mr. SMOOT. Let me call attention to another portion of the bill. For instance, the very first item, "for the Civil Service Commission," reads:

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, and for expenses of examinations and investigations held elsewhere than at Washington, \$6,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The language is there. I do not know that it does any harm.

Mr. SMOOT. As I am opposed to the provision anyway, I am perfectly satisfied to let it go; but the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House called my attention to it. I do not care whether the amendment is made or not.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is a matter the conference can adjust; but here is the law of 1882, which provides that—

No civil officer, clerk, draftsman, copyist, messenger, assistant messenger, mechanic, watchman, laborer, or other employee shall hereafter be employed at the seat of government in any executive department or subordinate bureau or office thereof, or be paid from any appropriation made for contingent expenses, or for any specific or general purpose, unless—

This is the general law—

such employment is authorized and payment therefor specifically provided in the law granting the appropriation.

So unless Congress specifically provides for using it in Washington it can not be used in Washington under the general law.

Mr. SMOOT. I can not say as to that. My attention had not been called to it before, but I think that with these words stricken out they can spend this appropriation anywhere they wish, including the city of Washington.

Mr. OVERMAN. Except in Washington City under the general law.

Mr. SMOOT. Again, I want to say that this is an urgent deficiency bill. We are appropriating here \$35,000 that is not a deficiency at all. The Government of the United States is not obligated for the payment of one cent of it. The appropriation belongs in an Agricultural appropriation bill, if it goes into any bill at all. The reason given by the Senators from Florida, in the first place, is that the money must be appropriated immediately, if the Government is going to appropriate any at all, so that the work can be begun at once. I have no doubt the citrus canker is a very dangerous disease to citrus trees. I have no doubt about that, nor would I object to the appropriation if it came in the regular way; but I do not believe that we ought to make on an urgent deficiency appropriation bill an appropriation which is not a deficiency in any sense of the word. The Government is not obligated, as I said, for one cent of the amount. This is simply giving \$35,000 to assist the people of Florida to eradicate, if possible, the disease known as the citrus canker.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it is scarcely fair to say that this appropriation is confined to taking care of the situation in Florida. The citrus canker was brought from Japan, it is supposed, into Mexico, and from Mexico into Texas, and from Texas it has gone along the Gulf. The States particularly suffering now are Louisiana, Mississippi, a portion of Alabama, and Florida, States where citrus fruits are grown, and those States are now confronted with the worst menace that has ever befallen the industry. Very largely Florida is interested. The trees which seem to be worst stricken by it are the grapefruit trees, and over \$200,000,000 have been invested by the people of Florida in grapefruit alone.

It is a disease which is very infectious, and the department says the only treatment for it is absolute eradication. They have not been able to find whether it is a fungous growth or whether it is of germ origin or what it is. The only thing they know is that it is destructive of the tree and the fruit, and the method of disposing of it at present is to set fire to the tree and burn it up. The growers of Florida raised a large fund, and they are cooperating with the Government. The Government is investigating the question as to how to treat the disease, its origin, its nature, and its effects.

This appropriation is in direct line with the activities of the Government under the Bureau of Plant Industry. It is an emergency in that the time for eradicating the disease must be in the months of January, February, and March. Three months of the year covers the time when this action must be taken if we are going to eradicate the disease.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was called out of the Chamber, and I did not hear the statement made about this item. Does this disease affect peach trees?

Mr. FLETCHER. It does not. It affects only citrus fruit trees.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course it is not in any proper sense an urgent deficiency, but apparently it is a pretty serious matter.

Mr. FLETCHER. It certainly is urgent. If it is not a deficiency, it is urgent.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have only one added observation to make about it, and that is I fear it is a subsidy.

Mr. FLETCHER. This item of \$35,000 is a very small item and the department ought to have it in hand. A part of it, I take, has already been expended. I think it comes more or less within the technical requirements of the Senator from Utah and the Senator from New Hampshire. Indeed, I know that the department sent agents down there, and they have been for some weeks investigating the disease and doing what they could to ascertain its location and the best methods of treating it.

I have not any doubt that a portion of the money has already been spent, and in view of that phase of it it is a deficiency. It certainly is urgent. The disease is not confined entirely to Florida. The department says:

Though the disease has been under investigation in the States of Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana during the past year, no means of prevention or control through the use of fungicides or other spray applications has yet been developed, the treatments found effective for most fungous diseases of plants having failed to control citrus canker.

The only method of control which appeared to be effective is the complete eradication of the disease from those regions most likely to suffer severely by its continuous presence through the destruction by burning of all infected nursery stock and of all infected trees in citrus groves.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How long has this insect or microbe or whatever it is been known? When was it first discovered in Florida, and to what extent has it been eradicated?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have found that it was probably brought into the State through some nursery stock imported about a year ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. It has been brought there very recently?

Mr. FLETCHER. Very recently. They have traced it to certain nursery stock, and wherever that stock was sold throughout the States this disease has developed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Has it spread over the State very largely, or is it sporadic?

Mr. FLETCHER. To a very great extent. It covers the entire citrus belt of the State. I can not say that all portions of the citrus-growing sections are affected.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is it very disastrous?

Mr. FLETCHER. It is absolutely disastrous and very infectious. Anything that goes through it—a cow passing through a grove has been found to carry the disease. Even an ice wagon passing from one grove to another has carried it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Have they discovered the germ?

Mr. FLETCHER. They have not yet found it. That is one thing the department are studying in connection with the State authorities, but they have not yet found what its origin is or the nature of the disease.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Nor what it is?

Mr. FLETCHER. No. The only thing that they know is that they must absolutely burn every tree or plant or shrub on which they find the disease.

The department says:

The citrus growers of Florida, working in cooperation with the State experiment station and nursery inspection service, have organized a campaign of eradication, which has been vigorously prosecuted during the past four months with a fair prospect of success if it can be adequately prosecuted throughout all the infected areas within that State during the winter months, when the trees are dormant and the spread of the disease is much less rapid than during the active growing season, which begins about midwinter and continues through spring and summer.

I will ask to have this report go in the Record. I will not read it all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Permission will be granted, unless there is objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Memorandum for item to be included in the urgent deficiency bill for the Bureau of Plant Industry.]

PROPOSED WORDING.

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the infectious nature and the continued spread of the destructive

disease of citrus trees known as citrus canker, by conducting such investigations of the nature and means of communication of the disease and by applying such methods of eradication or control of the disease as may, in his judgment, be necessary, \$35,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to pay such expenses and employ such persons and means, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and to cooperate with such authorities of the States concerned, organizations of growers or individuals, as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purpose.

EXPLANATION.

Within the past few weeks the attention of this department has been called to the destructive epidemic of citrus canker, a recently introduced disease, in the grapefruit districts of Florida and the Gulf States. Circumstantial evidence indicates that the disease was introduced into Texas from Japan about 1911, but because of its close resemblance to citrus scab, which had for some time been known in that State, it was not at the time recognized as a distinct disease, nor was its destructive nature discovered until a few months ago.

The experience of the past year has demonstrated that it is highly infectious to practically all kinds of citrus trees, affecting roots, trunks, old limbs, small twigs, leaves, and fruit. Although the diseased trees may continue to live in a very unthrifty and feeble condition, the effect of the disease is to promptly destroy the marketability of the fruit and therefore the earning capacity of the tree. It has been found to be especially destructive upon grapefruit, limes, and lemons, and to be spread from tree to tree through contact with cultivators, vehicles, the harness used on horses in the groves, and by the pruning tools, clothing, and hands of the workmen performing the ordinary cultural and harvesting operations.

Though the disease has been under investigation in the States of Florida, Alabama, and Louisiana during the past year no means of prevention or control through the use of fungicides or other spray applications has yet been developed, the treatments found effective for most fungous diseases of plants having failed to control citrus canker.

The only method of control which appears to be effective is the complete eradication of the disease from those regions most likely to suffer severely by its continued presence, through the destruction by burning of all infected nursery stock and of all infected trees in citrus groves.

From the commercial and financial standpoints the greatest danger is to the grapefruit industry of Florida. The best information available through commercial sources indicates that the annual shipments of grapefruit from that State now exceed 3,000,000 boxes. The grapefruit plantings in Florida are valued at approximately \$75,000,000. The entire citrus industry of the State, involving investments amounting to approximately \$200,000,000, will be jeopardized unless the disease is brought promptly under control. The citrus industries of the other Gulf States are also endangered, although less so than those of Florida, because of the smaller percentage of grapefruit trees in those States and the relatively larger proportion of Satsuma oranges in these plantings, this variety being much less seriously damaged by the canker than most of the citrus fruits.

The citrus growers of Florida, working in cooperation with the State Experiment Station and Nursery Inspection Service, have organized a campaign of eradication which has been vigorously prosecuted during the past four months with a fair prospect of success if it can be adequately prosecuted throughout all the infected areas within that State during the winter months when the trees are dormant and the spread of the disease is much less rapid than during the active growing season, which begins about midwinter and continues through spring and summer. Unfortunately the State authorities are without funds to meet the expenses of systematic inspection of the groves and the destruction of diseased trees by burning. The State legislature does not meet until April, and such action as it may take in the matter will not be in time to meet the emergency. The situation is particularly urgent in that it has recently been discovered that several hundred shipments of young trees from a nursery now known to have been infected were made to planters at various points in the State before the destructive character of the disease was discovered. The successful prosecution of the eradication campaign necessitates the immediate following up and location of all of the stock contained in these shipments and the inspection of the adjacent groves before the next general infection period occurs.

In the absence of appropriations available to meet the expenses of the systematic inspection and eradication work, the citrus growers have during the past few weeks raised approximately \$30,000 by subscription for this purpose. This amount is inadequate for the accomplishment of the work within the period in which it must be done, and in view of the menace to the important interests at stake in Florida and other Gulf States, it creates an exigency which this department should be authorized to meet.

It is therefore recommended that Congress be requested to include in the urgent deficiency bill an item appropriating \$35,000 to enable the department to cooperate with the State authorities and fruit-growers associations in Florida and other Gulf States, with a view to accomplishing the eradication of the disease from the regions in which it has proved destructive, during the next few months. It is estimated that this amount will be required for the employment of competent men in cooperation with the State authorities and growers' organizations, and the meeting of the necessary field expenses. No reimbursement of the value of trees destroyed in the eradication work is contemplated. To effectively accomplish this purpose the funds should be available by January 1, since to defer the work until later in the season would render impossible the eradication of the disease from the present comparatively restricted centers of infection and permit of its spread to an extent that would probably place it beyond control.

Mr. FLETCHER. In the report it is shown that the time for taking care of the disease is between the 1st of January and the 1st of April, and unless the work is performed then enormous damage will be done.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should like to ask the Senator how does it affect the trees. Does it kill the tree or cause the fruit to drop?

Mr. FLETCHER. It gradually saps the vitality of the tree and also affects injuriously the fruit.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observe the Senator was not quite correct in saying that it does not affect the orange crop.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not understand the Senator. I thought he asked about peaches.

Mr. GALLINGER. I meant to ask about oranges, if I said peaches.

Mr. FLETCHER. The Senator said peaches. It does affect all the citrus varieties. I do not think it affects peaches or apples.

Mr. GALLINGER. The testimony shows that the value of the grapefruit industry of Florida is approximately \$75,000,000. That is a very great industry; and, really, from reading the testimony it does seem that this is a very serious matter and that the Government might well come to the aid of the people of the States where the industry is affected and render some help. It seems the people of Florida themselves have raised \$30,000,000 for this purpose. I hope the provision in the bill will remain.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I wish to say that as a member of the committee I had first the impression that it would be best for this appropriation to be made in the agricultural appropriation bill, but knowing that that bill has not yet passed the House of Representatives, and that likely it will not be submitted to the Senate for some time, and this being a matter of so urgent a nature, I felt that it ought to be included in this bill.

It is a meritorious appropriation. It is necessary that it should be available soon, because it takes time to send men to Florida to visit the various groves and pick out the trees that it is necessary to burn. Consequently, we are even now late in providing an appropriation of this nature.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to say a few words. I do not care to argue the proposition. It will be noticed that in the paragraph preceding this item an appropriation is made for the purchase and destruction of animals having the foot-and-mouth disease. In the same way as animals now living are hereafter to be killed and paid for, it might be said that that is not a deficiency.

This disease shows itself in Florida about July or August. The appropriation will not be used to pay for any property destroyed. Property of very great value has already been destroyed. They do not dare to cut the tree down and then burn it up, but they spread oil upon it and burn it where it stands.

I do not believe this matter would have been brought to the attention of Congress if it had not been for the fact that the Legislature of Florida does not meet until April, and, as stated by my colleague, if the Government is to render any assistance at all it must be done between now and that time.

Furthermore, I can see that a certain part of the responsibility for the spread of this disease can be charged directly to the Government. It was by no act of the citrus growers of Florida that this pest, whatever it is, came there. It was brought from Japan into Mexico and from Mexico into Texas, and then by the sale of nursery stock it got into the State of Florida. In that way the Government is more to blame than the State for allowing it to get there.

The Senator from Louisiana stated to me since this amendment has been under discussion that some nursery stock—a thousand trees or a thousand dollars' worth—had been shipped from Florida to Louisiana and burned there, and the nurseryman who gave the order, who was doing a very large business, has practically been made a bankrupt because practically all his nursery has been burned in order to get rid of this disease.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Does the Senator know whether this citrus canker exists in Texas now?

Mr. BRYAN. Oh, yes; it exists in Texas. It was from Texas that within a very recent time it came to Florida. Of course, it had to come before July last, because it was spread over the groves in July.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. BRYAN], I desire to say that of the \$2,500,000 appropriated to the Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Animal Industry, for the arrest and eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, \$2,000,000 is a deficiency that has already been spent, and the additional \$500,000 is for the purpose of continuing the investigation and for the purchase and destruction of animals affected by the disease. That is quite different from the appropriation of \$35,000 for citrus fruit trees. The expenditure of the money and also the appropriation is under the act of February 27, 1906, and as provided in that act the loss of human life was involved. I would not want the Senator's statement to go uncorrected, because I think there is a difference between the appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease and the appropriation of \$35,000 for the destruction of the citrus canker.

Mr. BRYAN. Let me ask the Senator if the half million dollars that has not been spent is not a deficiency at this time?

Mr. SMOOT. It is true it is not a deficiency, but I will say to the Senator that the Senate has already passed a bill appropriating not \$500,000 but \$1,000,000 for this same purpose.

Mr. BRYAN. That has been used to pay for the stock that has been destroyed.

Mr. SMOOT. And for the investigation.

Mr. BRYAN. This small appropriation to which the Senator objects can only be used for the purpose of scientific investigation and advice by the experts of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. The appropriation does not only apply to the destruction of animals that may have the foot-and-mouth disease, but it is also for the purpose of carrying on the work of investigation as to whether they have the foot-and-mouth disease and where located.

Mr. BRYAN. I understand. There is this distinction, however, a part of the money will be used for the payment of property, and under this provision no money will be used except for the purpose of investigation.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course the payment for property comes under the present law. The Government is required to pay for the destruction of animals that may be suffering from foot-and-mouth disease. In the case of every animal that is destroyed the law compels the Government to pay for it.

Mr. RANDELL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a word in regard to this item. My State is very much interested in the citrus industry. It is growing very rapidly in the State. I received a letter just a few days ago from a prominent citrus grower saying, if I recollect it correctly, that a thousand dollar shipment of citrus trees from Florida into the city of Hammond, State of Louisiana, had been seized by the agriculture authorities of the State and burned because the citrus canker was found among the trees. He asked me to watch this matter as closely as possible, and thought it was very important to this young and growing industry of the State that the disease should be eradicated.

I sincerely hope the appropriation will be made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, and read the next paragraph, as follows:

FOREST SERVICE.

For "General expenses, Forest Service," including the same objects specified under this head in the Agricultural appropriation act for the fiscal year 1915, \$349,243.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, while I shall make no effort to amend this paragraph, the committee having disagreed with me, I want to give the Senate some facts in regard to this appropriation, and not only as to this department of the Government but also as to others.

The fiscal year 1914 began July 1, 1914, and will end June 30 of this year. An estimate came for an appropriation for the Forest Service. We gave them \$3,000,000. In addition to that we gave them \$250,000 for fighting fires. They have spent in six months \$671,000 for fighting fires. I am told by Senators from Western States that they have had no unusual fires out there. The department says they have; but here is a department estimating \$250,000, the Senate gives them everything they ask for, and in less than six months they have spent \$671,000. At 25 cents an hour, \$2 a day, it would take 25,000 men to fight fires for a month. I want to say that the departments come here with their estimates. They will make estimates some time for a large sum and we cut them down. Then they get around it by going and spending the money anyway and coming in here and asking us for a deficiency. This department had \$3,000,000. They had \$250,000 given them to spend for a year. They spent it in six months, then drew on the \$3,000,000 for \$72,000, and then for \$300,000 more, and then they come here within six months and ask us to make an appropriation of \$671,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. What would be the sum total of expenditures of this fiscal year for that department according to their estimates and expenses?

Mr. OVERMAN. If they go on in this way, there is no telling. They will again come back with a deficiency. For six months they have spent \$671,000 for fighting fires, when I am told by Senators from Western States that there have been actually no unusual fires out there this year. I am unable to guess; I do not know how much they will spend during the next six months. They already have had \$3,000,000 of appropriations.

Mr. SMOOT. In answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] I will state that we appropriated for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1915, \$3,243,000. Included in that amount was \$150,000 for fighting and preventing fires. Then, under miscellaneous items, in that bill there was added another \$100,000 for the purpose of fighting and preventing forest fires. That would make the appropriations for that one bureau a little over \$3,300,000. I do not know whether we shall have in the regular deficiency bill an additional amount asked for; but if what has been appropriated and what is carried in this bill is expended, it will amount to over three and a half million dollars for the Forestry Bureau.

Mr. BORAH. Well, Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. OVERMAN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. That seems a large sum of money. Was there any hearing showing whether or not it had been properly expended or whether there had been any waste of the money, or anything of that kind?

Mr. OVERMAN. The only thing set out in the hearings, Mr. President, is that—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair would ask if there is a proposition pending to strike out a part of the bill?

Mr. OVERMAN. No. I am merely calling attention to the matter. The money has been spent, and we ought to know how it has been spent. Something ought to be done with reference to it. I want to say to the Senator that I was in favor of striking out the provision and take the amount out of the balance of the \$3,000,000 appropriation which they have.

The Senator from Idaho asked me a question as to the hearings. The officers of the bureau stated that they have had some fires in Oregon, a few in Montana, and some in Washington. I am told by the Senators from those States that they have had no unusual fires out there. They say the money is spent chiefly in the employment of men, to whom 25 cents an hour is paid. That was expended entirely in fighting forest fires. Twenty-five cents an hour would be \$2 a day. The Senator can calculate how many men they have had employed—over 25,000 men.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will state that this debate is out of order unless there is some proposition pending. The reading of the bill can not be stopped to make speeches, unless there is something before the Senate to which the debate can be directed.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I realize that the Chair is quite correct, and I therefore move, in line 5, on page 6, to strike out the appropriation "\$349,243."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That motion will leave merely the text without the appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; that is the way I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I desire to be heard on that for just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, the acting chairman of the committee suggests that there were no unusual fires in the national forests last year.

Mr. OVERMAN. There were no unusual fires there.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. He suggests that there were no unusual fires there, as he has been informed by Senators from that section. Since the bill was reported, Mr. President, I have taken it upon myself to ascertain what the number of fires was and in what particular States they occurred for which this money was expended. I may say—and this is authenticated by the records—that the fires during the past year, 1914, were more disastrous than any we have ever had, except those in 1910, in areas covered and in the number of fires which occurred. Those fires were distributed as follows:

In the first district, embracing Montana, northern Idaho, and North Dakota, there were 1,975 of such fires; in district No. 2, including Colorado, eastern Wyoming, South Dakota, Nebraska, Minnesota, and Michigan, there were 279; in district No. 3, embracing Arizona and New Mexico, there were 509; in district No. 4, embracing Utah, Nevada, southern Idaho, and western Wyoming, there were 327; in district No. 5, California, there were 1,468; in district No. 6, embracing Oregon and Washington, there were 1,239; in district No. 7, embracing Arkansas, Florida, and the White Mountains—the Appalachian region—there were 315, such fires amounting in all to 6,112.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do.

Mr. BORAH. Does the report give any idea of the extent of the fires—how aggravated they were or how large?

Mr. OVERMAN. I can answer that question.

Mr. BORAH. I have seen some fires that it would not cost over 25 cents to put out.

Mr. OVERMAN. The question is answered in the report. Of the entire six thousand and odd fires which swept the forests, 81 per cent were handled without difficulty and with very small loss; 81 per cent of them did not cover over 10 acres.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I want to say that that very statement justifies all the expenditures that have been made for the protection of our national forests. In 1910 there was a much larger area burned over, and the fires were more destructive, because the department did not then have the appliances necessary to fight such fires. I call attention to the fact as showing the increased efficiency of the service, which has been brought about by the expenditure of these moneys. I call attention to the further fact, Mr. President, that the expenditures for the Forestry Department have been gradually going down, notwithstanding the statement of some of my colleagues.

Now, as showing the increased efficiency of the organization over that of former years may be stated the results: In the Colville forest in 1910, with 62 fires, 155,200 acres were burned, with a cost for fire fighting of \$18,000; in 1914, with 103 fires, and a drier season, the total area burned was 7,653 acres, with a cost for fire fighting of \$15,900. Still again, in the Tahoe forest in 1910 there were 84 fires, and such a serious situation developed that the United States troops were called upon for aid. This year—and I call especial attention to this—there were 223 fires handled by the organization without help, and the loss was less.

In the Trinity Forest, where there were 51 fires in 1910, which burned over 23,192 acres, in 1914 53 fires burned over only 459 acres. In California, where there were quite a number of fires this year as compared with 1910, the average acreage per fire in 1910 was 653, while in 1914 it was but 37 acres; while the average for fires in the timber, excluding brush fires, was this year only 15 acres. In other words, the areas of the fires are each year diminishing because of the increased efficiency of the service. This increased efficiency has been brought about by the appropriation of money necessary to properly combat the fires.

I call attention to another thing, Mr. President. My distinguished colleague on the committee, who has this bill in charge, always, properly too, fights these so-called deficiency appropriations; but I call attention to the fact that in 1911 there was a million dollars included in the appropriation bill for the purpose of fighting forest fires, and yet none of it was expended. The next year they concluded in the next appropriation bill that inasmuch as no part of that had been expended they would make the appropriation very much less, and they appropriated but \$200,000. The next year they reduced it to \$100,000, and this year the Agricultural appropriation bill, which is pending before the House of Representatives, has eliminated this protection in the national forests from the bill altogether. So, under the law as it now stands the department has authority to increase these deficiencies, and if they are going to protect the property that belongs to the people of this whole country they must create these deficiencies against which Senators are now protesting here so loudly.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. In order that the RECORD may be straight, I wish to say that the million dollars, of which the Senator from Oregon speaks, for 1911, was a deficiency which was caused by fires in 1910. Does the Senator not remember that we had during the year 1910 extensive fires, which were attended by great loss of life in Idaho and also in a number of other Western States?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask the Senator from Utah to look at the records for 1910, wherein he will find that there was a million dollars included in the Agricultural appropriation bill, but it was not used at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite positive that the deficiency appropriation bill in 1911 carried an appropriation of a million dollars for the purpose of paying for the fighting of fires of 1910, in which year the country had the most disastrous fires which had occurred for very many years. I call attention to the statement of Mr. Graves, Chief Forester. He says:

Mr. GRAVES. The situation was that we had in the northwestern States and on the Pacific slope an unusual drought. We had a very

long dry season, equal in severity, so far as forest-fire hazard was concerned, to that of 1910.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that the bad year?

Mr. GRAVES. Yes, sir; that was the bad year, when we had to come to Congress for a deficiency of about \$1,000,000. In some parts of the Northwest, particularly in Oregon and Washington, the drought was a long one, there being in Washington and Oregon 74 days without rain.

Therefore, I think the statement which the Senator made should at least be qualified, because in the year 1910, not only did they spend all of the money which was appropriated, but they came to the Congress of the United States and asked for a deficiency of a million dollars.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, my memory is not in accord with the Senator's upon that point, though he may be correct. My understanding of it is different, but it is a matter of easy verification by an examination of the appropriation bills. What I am getting at, however, is the fact that the appropriations for the purpose of protecting the national domain have been growing less each year, because the moneys which have been expended in times past have gone to increase the efficiency of the fire-fighting force.

Within the last four years great strides have been made in equipping the forests and in the organization of the force, as will be seen from the following figures: In the first place, during this time there have been added 1,368 miles of road, 9,617 miles of trail, 12,000 miles of telephone, 300 new fully equipped look-out stations, 695 headquarters buildings, and many other improvements. The forests have had a great increase of equipment in the way of tools and tool caches, portable telephones, tents, and so forth, as well as in transportation facilities.

Mr. President, all of these things for which these moneys have been expended in times past make it easier and cheaper for the Government to control the situation in the future. If the policy advocated by some Senators is carried out and we are absolutely to abandon the forests to destruction by the elements, then we might as well stop at one time as at another; but I, for one, Mr. President, will never consent to the elimination of items from the appropriation bills which go to protect this property which belongs to the people of the whole country.

I do not belong to the school of those who feel that the public domain should be opened up to the indiscriminate taking of everybody who comes along. I have just as good cause to complain as anybody, if there is cause to complain, because at least one-fifth of the area of my State, and probably more, is embraced within national forests; but, Mr. President, if I had it within my power to-morrow to release those lands for the purpose of settlement or acquisition by the public, I would not take such action, for the simple reason that until the homestead law and other statutes under which the public domain may be acquired shall have been amended the lands will be taken up in the future just as they have been taken up in the past.

Now, in my own State hundreds of thousands of acres of land belong to the Weyerhaeusers which ought to belong to the people and ought to be included within the reserves. Not only that, but the Northern Pacific Railroad Co. owns immense tracts of land that ought to belong to the people. Not only does the Northern Pacific own much land formerly a part of the public domain, but the Southern Pacific also owns great tracts of it.

Some of these lands have been acquired by great corporations in questionable ways. Some of them have been acquired through the efforts of dummy entrymen. School-teachers, schoolboys, and girls in department stores have been hired to go into the West—it is true of my State, and I think I can safely say the same statement is true of other States—and have entered lands, and as soon as title was acquired by going before the proper authorities and swearing falsely the lands have been turned over to great timber syndicates and railroad companies. That is what would happen if these lands were now open to entry.

I know my distinguished friend from Idaho differs very essentially from me as to this proposition. I go with him this far: I say that all the land in the Northwest within forest reserves which is more valuable for agricultural purposes than for timber or mineral purposes ought to be opened up to the public; but in my State, at least—and I think it is pretty generally true of the Senator's State—there is very little land included within the forest reserves that is more valuable for agricultural than for other purposes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has not yet made any statement of fact with which I disagree. If the Senator will assist me in eliminating from the forest reserves those lands which are

agricultural, I will raise no complaint whatever about retaining in the reserves the forest lands. I am only complaining of the withholding of agricultural lands while hundreds of good people are waiting to make them into farms.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I think the Senator and I have pretty generally worked together along that line. The only difference I have had with the Senator usually is that the Senator has always shown an indisposition, as it has seemed to me, to expend the necessary sums of money for the protection of the great forests that exist in his State and in mine.

Mr. President, the forests ought to be preserved, and the record here, the hearings before the House on this very bill, will show that the properties of the Government were protected with a less expenditure this year than they ever were before, and that the small amount which is now sought to be appropriated for the protection of the forests is a mere bagatelle in comparison with the value of that which was in danger of being destroyed, but which was not destroyed simply because the Forestry Bureau acted with efficiency and with zeal in the protection of the property of the Government.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, if the Senator is through—I do not want to interrupt if he is not—

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I do not believe I could say anything more to enlighten the Senate. I have no disposition to speak on the subject at any length, but I do want to protest against the parsimony that is displayed by some Senators, who, for the purpose of saving an appropriation of \$350,000 in round numbers, would incur the risk of losing millions of dollars in property which belongs to the people of this whole country.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that we can not possibly save it, because it has already been spent.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. And property has been saved, too.

Mr. SMOOT. I say we can not save the appropriation.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I disagree very little with the Senator from Oregon, except as to possibly some of his conclusions and some of his generalizations. A few years ago I was driving across a portion of my State in company with a gentleman from Ohio, and when we were in the midst of a vast area of country I said to him, "You are now in a forest reserve." Apparently he challenged my veracity, and said, "It can not be possible that this is a forest reserve. Where is the forest?" There was not a tree in sight; over the vast plains the god of nature had never been able to grow a tree in all the years of the past. Some of it was as good agricultural land as any other part of the State of Idaho.

Mr. President, I have never voted against what I believed to be a sufficient amount of money to really protect our forest reserves. No one can be more concerned in the protection of the forests than those who live near the forests, because the destruction of the forests by fire is calculated to injure or destroy all that we have on the outside of the forests, and therefore I am thoroughly in favor of any appropriation, and am willing to make it liberal, for the protection of the forests. But, Mr. President, we discuss here the protection of forests which do not exist; that is to say, we are guarding and surveilling and superintending thousands and thousands of acres upon which there are no forests. These lands ought not to be there, to be watched over and policed at the people's expense; they ought to be producing wheat and hay and fruit and the other things which people stand in so much need of.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Will not the Senator admit that within the past two or three years, as rapidly as the department has been able to do so, they have released from the reserves land that did not actually grow timber?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; they have been releasing some lands; they have released them very slowly, but if they will keep that up I will not complain about their being a little slow. However, Mr. President, when we began to demand the release of such lands the Senator will recall that we were met with the statement that there were no agricultural lands to be released, and it has only been by persistent presentation of the question time and time again that we have been able to secure action in releasing agricultural lands.

Mr. President, there are counties in my State which are practically covered by forest reserves; and it becomes a question of whether or not they can exist unless the land can properly be settled by homesteaders and people can be induced to live there who are willing to acquire title and to pay taxes to help sustain the Government, and therefore we are persistently asking that the agricultural lands be excluded from the forest reserves. When you shall have done so you will limit and re-

duce very largely indeed the amount of expenditures which are now being made. For that we contend, and for nothing more.

Let me call the Senator's attention to another fact. The Senator stated that these lands belong to the people, that these forests belong to the people. I agree with that proposition thoroughly; but I find, as I said upon the floor of the Senate a day or two ago, that within the last five years 500,000 of those same people, who were as good citizens as we had in this country, have gone into a foreign country and taken the oath of allegiance to a foreign Government in order to get lands upon which to build homes, while we have thousands and millions of acres tied up in forest reserves. I do not think I am opposing the interests of the people when I insist upon the right of dedicating our agricultural lands to those who desire to plant homes upon them. The best service I can give the people is to help the people get homes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. May I ask the Senator a question at this point?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. The trouble is, Mr. President, that the word "people" is used in such an intangible, abstract way that it does not do anyone any good to get a result for the benefit of the people, because there is nobody to be helped. I want to come down to the concrete, individual application of the law to the man who wants a home.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will ask the Senator is it not true that the inducement which has caused a great many American citizens to go into Saskatchewan, Alberta, and other sections of Canada has been the fact that they find there virgin territory and a condition precisely similar to that which pertained in our section of the country 40 years ago, when people from the eastern section of the United States went out West and settled upon land. They would go there in spite of the law. They have left our borders simply because there is virgin land to be taken in British Columbia while there is probably none to be taken in our country, even if the forest reserves were opened up to settlement.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes, Mr. President; they went there because there were virgin lands in Canada and because the virgin land in our territory had been covered into forest reserves. I agree with the Senator thoroughly that that is the reason why they went to Canada, and for the other reason that when they found a piece of land in Canada they could secure title to it sometime within the lifetime of a single individual. Canada, as the Senator knows, has a law which permits a homesteader to acquire title in three years, while until within the last two years our law required him to live upon the land for five years. That provision of the Canadian law, of course, induced considerable emigration to Canada, together with the fact that the land there was undoubtedly available. While there was also land in our country, it was not available.

Mr. President, I moved to strike out this item because I wanted more information regarding it. I presume that there is some portion of the proposed appropriation, perhaps all of it, for aught I know, that is justly in the bill. I have no desire to deny that which is needed, but I observe the same extravagance here as marks the whole of our Government expenditures. While we are remembering that these are the "people's" forests, that this is also the "people's" money we are spending.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I presume the Senator from Idaho made the motion in order to discuss this question.

Mr. BORAH. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. Before the Senator withdraws the motion to strike out, I desire to say a few words in answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN], who said that I was in the habit of fighting deficiency appropriations. That is true, Mr. President. In 1906 the piling up of deficiencies by the departments grew into a scandal. Congress would make appropriations based upon the estimates of the departments, but, notwithstanding the appropriations thus made, they took the liberty—and this is true of all the departments; it is not confined to one—of spending all the money they wanted to spend here and there and everywhere, and then coming in with a deficiency.

The practice became such a scandal and an outrage that Congress itself passed a law designed to correct the evil. That law is now on the statute books, although I think it is not observed. I will read it into the RECORD right here in the hope that some of the departments will take notice of it and realize what the law is; perhaps they have forgotten about it. I think I am doing my duty when I examine all deficiency items to see whether or not they were properly incurred. Like the Senator from Idaho in this instance I have not enough evidence to justify me in moving to strike out the item; I can not tell much about it; but I know that they have spent in six months \$600,000, when their estimate—and we gave them every cent

they estimated for—was \$250,000. Here is the provision which Congress enacted in 1906:

Sec. 3679. No executive department or other Government establishment of the United States shall expend, in any one fiscal year, any sum in excess of appropriations made by Congress for that fiscal year, or involve the Government in any contract or other obligation for the future payment of money in excess of such appropriations unless such contract or obligation is authorized by law. Nor shall any department or any officer of the Government accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

It is upon that idea, I suppose, that they have spent this \$600,000.

All appropriations made for contingent expenses or other general purposes, except appropriations made in fulfillment of contract obligations expressly authorized by law, or for objects required or authorized by law without reference to the amounts annually appropriated therefor, shall, on or before the beginning of each fiscal year, be so apportioned by monthly or other allotments as to prevent expenditures in one portion of the year which may necessitate deficiency or additional appropriations to complete the service of the fiscal year for which said appropriations are made; and all such apportionments shall be adhered to and shall not be waived or modified except upon the happening of some extraordinary emergency or unusual circumstance which could not be anticipated at the time of making such apportionment, but this provision shall not apply to the contingent appropriations of the Senate or House of Representatives; and in case said apportionments are waived or modified as herein provided, the same shall be waived or modified in writing by the head of such executive department or other Government establishment having control of the expenditure, and the reasons therefor shall be fully set forth in each particular case and communicated to Congress in connection with estimates for any additional appropriations required on account thereof. Any person violating any provision of this section shall be summarily removed from office and may also be punished by a fine of not less than \$100 or by imprisonment for not less than one month.

Here is the statute; here is the law; and I want to give notice to the departments that I intend to examine critically all these deficiency items, because the law says that such expenditures shall not be incurred, and that the departments shall not spend more money than is appropriated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho withdraw the amendment proposed by him?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, Mr. President, the law referred to by the Senator from North Carolina is really a very subtle piece of humor, so far as that is concerned.

I wish to say just one word more before I withdraw the amendment. The Senator from Oregon spoke about settlers acquiring homes, making homesteads, and so forth, upon these lands. I want to say, for fear I may be considered as misrepresenting the situation, that there is a provision in the law by which a man can go in a forest reserve and secure a homestead within a forest reserve; but in the application of that law the conditions are so onerous that settlers have practically ceased to avail themselves of it, and for this reason: A man goes into a forest reserve and makes application to file upon a piece of land. The application is considered, and may be granted or may not be; or the forestry officials may permit him to experiment for a time to see whether or not he can make a success of farming on that particular piece of ground, say, in one or two years; and if so, at the end of that time they will grant him a title. So in the application of the law it is practically a dead letter, for the reason that no man, unless he has a large bank account, can afford to go upon these lands and experiment at the discretion of some one in the department as to whether or not he can make a home.

What we ought to have is a law defining what the man shall do; and after he shall have complied with the terms of the law the power ought not to reside in any man to deny him his title or to his homestead; but when it is left to the discretion of the department, and the man is a man of limited means, he can not cope with the situation, and the result is that they have practically ceased to acquire homesteads under this law.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should not say anything concerning this matter except for the statements which have been made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. I differ from him so thoroughly with respect to those matters that I want to state the facts with reference to the expenditures for the Forest Service.

The Forestry Service had an appropriation for 1912 of \$5,217,000. The receipts were \$2,109,000. I leave out the odd dollars and odd cents. The loss to the Government was \$3,108,000. Now, when you consider that of the amount which the Government received 35 per cent was paid over to the State it leaves a deficit, so far as the United States Treasury is concerned, of \$3,800,000. In other words, the Government is getting and putting into its own Treasury from grazing rentals and sales of timber only \$1 out of every \$3 that it expends. The appropriation for 1913 was \$5,092,111, and the expenditures were \$2,391,920, which leaves a deficit, so far as the United States is concerned, in actual expenditures above receipts of \$2,700,000. Considering the fact that out of these receipts the

Government pays 35 per cent to the State—25 per cent for school purposes and 10 per cent for road purposes—the result is that it left a deficit, so far as the United States was concerned, of \$3,490,000. The appropriation we made last fall was even greater than these appropriations.

When it comes to the appropriation made here it shows that even the figures I have quoted do not show the total loss to the Government, because we are now adding \$349,000 to the loss of the United States. I am one of those who believe that when we have a law we ought to comply with it and try to carry out its provisions. I am not here to move to strike out this appropriation, nor am I here to cripple the service, because it was a necessary expenditure under existing law; but I want to call the attention of the Senate—and this seems to be a good opportunity—to the fact that we are making appropriations for the Forestry Service year after year and expending practically \$3 to \$1 of net receipts to the Government.

Mr. President, that was the same experience this Government had with the leasing system of the early part of the last century as applied to the lead mines in Territories. That was just exactly the result, namely, an expenditure upon the part of the Government of \$4 for every dollar it collected in royalty. These broad forest reserves have been spread over our States in a manner that makes it almost impossible for counties to maintain their schools and their county governments, because the reserved lands are not liable to taxation, notwithstanding State, county, and school governments must be maintained over them. In my State they have already withdrawn coal lands which the Government of the United States estimates to be worth \$500,000,000. Is it possible that the Commonwealth of Colorado can afford to let lands of the value of \$500,000,000 remain without taxation for the support of State, county, and school governments? Is that right?

The trouble with all these leasing propositions—and the forest-reserve system is a leasing proposition—is that they are attacking the very sovereignty of the State, because if there is one principle that is recognized above another it is that a State has the right to impose taxes upon every foot of territory within its borders. Whenever you deny that right, you deny to the State the right of existence, and you deny the means of support to the State government itself. No one approves fraudulent land entries, and the Government has the means of preventing the same.

I want to say, with respect to the forest reserves in my State, that 40 per cent of them are upon lands that are above timber line, where nothing but bushes exists. Not only that, but in my State 30 per cent of the same is what is called scrub timber. Consequently there is only 30 per cent left that is merchantable timber. The result is that these reserves ought to be cut down to the 30 per cent of good timber. That is what ought to be done. The present Secretary of Agriculture has cut them down to some extent. I think the forest reserves in my State have been reduced from 16,000,000 acres to 14,500,000 acres, but two-thirds of that area ought not to receive the attention of the Government. These large reserves embarrass and prevent the development of the country, discourage miners from going in there, because there is always a supervision which the miner objects to, and because of the rules and regulations made by the department with respect to having somebody pass upon whether the mine is a pay mine or is likely to become a paying mine, and making the title to the mine dependent upon such inspection after the miner has performed his \$500 worth of work.

This appropriation is to repay a past expenditure. I believe that when a necessity arises in order to prevent fire the expenditure ought to be reimbursed. We ought sometimes to go to the fundamentals, and restrict these forest reserves to something that is within the bounds of reason, so that we will not have gigantic forest reserves equal to the area of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Rhode Island combined in my own State.

Mr. President, while I believe in this appropriation, and voted for it in the Committee on Appropriations, in view of the statement which was made by the Senator from Oregon, I wish to voice my protest against the manner in which this system has been carried on. When we consider reforestation it is absolutely absurd, so far as my State is concerned. This very Agricultural Department has reported that a pine tree grown at an altitude of 7,500 feet in my State takes 200 years to develop to a thickness of 19.6 inches.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes, sir.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to ask the Senator a question—possibly I understand the matter without having the Senator enlighten me—as to the method adopted in establishing these forest reserves. Is it an arbitrary method on the part of the

officials of the Government to select a section of country which they say shall become a forest reserve?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that their opinion prevails?

Mr. SHAFROTH. They generally send out a commission, and they take in broad areas. In my State 16,000,000 acres was taken in. It has been reduced to 14,500,000 acres, but that is equal to two or three small States. The fact that it takes in all character of lands, including 65 per cent of the mineral belt of my State, has impaired our mineral development to such an extent that in 1900 we had in the State of Colorado 41,000 metalliferous miners, and the last census—1910—showed that we had but 19,000. The miners will not prospect under those conditions, and thereby a development of the country is retarded.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will further ask the Senator as to the feeling that exists in the State of Colorado on this question?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, it exists to a very strong extent. The Democratic platforms and the Republican platforms for years have both, in most vigorous terms, assaulted the entire policy. We are willing to have forest reserves, but we want genuine forest reserves. This thing of talking about reforestation is absurd in my State. It may be that in some portions of the United States it might be proper, but where it takes 200 years to grow a tree it is absurd to talk about reforestation. As the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] says, we want forests with trees in them.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think the Senator is entirely right on that point. I am a great friend of forestry and of the Forest Service in a general way, but I ask the Senator the question because I have absorbed the belief, from hearing these debates so eloquently presented by Senators from the great States of the West, that there ought to be some remedy for the existing conditions. Can the Senator suggest any?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, I suggest that these forest reserves be cut down to what is forest land; and if that is done, 70 per cent would be eliminated in my State.

Mr. GALLINGER. What would be the modus operandi to accomplish that result?

Mr. SHAFROTH. To limit the reserve. You could do it either by a bill or direct that it be cut down, or it could be done by Executive order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely; but if it was not done by Executive order, then I assume it would require legislation.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, yes; it would require legislation if it were not done by Executive order.

Mr. GALLINGER. Are strenuous efforts being made, or is consideration being given to the propriety of legislation touching this matter?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Why, Mr. President, instead of that we have under consideration in committees of this Congress the fastening upon us of a leasing system not only of all of the coal lands, but also of the phosphate lands, the asphaltum lands, and the water-power sites, requiring the payment of royalties to the Government of the United States, to be divided between the Government and the States after they have been turned into the reclamation fund and have been repaid by the people of the West.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have heard objections strenuously urged against the existing condition of things by Senators from Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, I think California, and possibly other States. It seems to me that if the Senators from those States would unite in an effort to remedy what seems to be an evil, they would find support enough from the rest of us to accomplish the result.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one moment?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that an effort was made a few years ago to limit what we thought was the undue exercise of departmental discretion, and both Houses of Congress passed a law providing that in certain States no further reservations should be made except by affirmative action of Congress. That law passed both Houses of Congress and was before the department for its consideration; but before that law was signed by the President, in defiance of the expressed will of Congress, more than 11,000,000 additional acres were put into these reserves.

The Senator asks how these reserves are created, whether by arbitrary power or not. The answer was made that commissions are sometimes sent out. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that the very inception of this movement was when the Congress of the United States appropriated \$25,000 to send out a commission to look over this western country and recommend to the President what lands should be included

within the reserves. That commission expended the \$25,000. They made a report to the President. Upon that report and other information the President acted; and yet it developed, upon hearing, that that commission, spending \$25,000, did not go near the land, nor had they any personal observation or knowledge of the land which they recommended should go into the reserve.

Mr. GALLINGER. In that connection I will say that I have frequently been told and I have frequently read that these forest reserves are usually selected by certain gentlemen looking through a car window, and that they do not exercise the care that ought to be exercised in a matter of such great importance.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I want to say, in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from New Hampshire, that the western Senators have at various times introduced bills, and there are a number of bills now pending, dealing with this subject. The difference between the bills that are introduced by most of the western Senators is one which appeals to the question of entry and location by which title can be obtained and by which the State can have the right of taxation upon the property; whereas the bills that have been introduced by others relate to the leasing or royalty system by which title never leaves the Government, which means perpetual ownership in the Federal Government and which means consequently the exemption of these lands from State, county, and school taxation forever. When you consider that in the West 30 years' payment of taxes upon any property with reasonable interest upon each yearly payment amounts to the value of the land, you can readily see that the people of this western country are taxed every year the value of this land to maintain government over these forest reserves and other resources of the public domain that are proposed to be the subject of royalty.

Mr. President, I do not want to discuss the matter. I believe that this appropriation ought to be allowed, because it is a necessary expenditure that has been made; fundamentally there ought to be a change in the entire forestry system.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, just a word before I withdraw the amendment.

I do not desire that my position in regard to these forest reserves shall be misunderstood, and I repeat what I have said before, in a more explicit way, that I have no objection to forest reserves as such. I am thoroughly in favor of forest reserves when they are created upon forest lands; and if we could have eliminated from the forest reserves those lands which are purely agricultural lands and fit for making homes and farms, practically all the opposition to the forest reserves would disappear from the West.

I made this suggestion with reference to striking out this item for the same reason that I have called it to the attention of the Senate before. I want to keep before the Senate what I believe to be true from personal observation and personal examination—that there are not only thousands but hundreds of thousands of acres within these forest reserves upon which timber has never grown, which are more valuable for agriculture than for timber, which are fitted for the purpose of making homes, and those are the lands we are asking to have opened to entry.

Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho is withdrawn.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before the Senator withdraws his amendment I simply wish to say a word by way of explanation.

I voted for this provision in the committee. I did so because of the fact that the money has been spent. I also want to say that of all the money that is spent in the Forest Service, that which is spent for protection against fire is the money that is best spent. I do not, however, approve of having a deficiency appropriation for even this purpose every year; and I think myself that in the future either there ought to be a larger appropriation made for this purpose, or there should not be so much money spent as there has been. I want to express the opinion that the agricultural bill should carry a larger appropriation for this purpose, and that we should not have a deficiency every year.

My own State is not so largely withdrawn for forest purposes as some of the other Western States, although there are counties in my State where 93 per cent of the land is now withdrawn from entry, and out of the other 7 per cent all the taxes must be obtained for the maintenance of government. It is an impossibility for that part of our country to receive sufficient taxes to carry on the government as it ought to be carried on.

I believe in the Forest Service; that is, I believe that the real forest lands ought to be withdrawn from entry. I believe that the Forest Service ought to control those lands, but I do not believe that agricultural lands ought to be withdrawn as

forest lands. I now predict that if there is not a change in the policy, if the agricultural lands are not eliminated from the withdrawals, action will be taken by Congress, for the situation is intolerable. There is no one in my State, however, who is not perfectly willing that all of the forest lands should be withdrawn as such. They approve of it. It has been a blessing to the people, from the fact that we have so very little timber in our State; but it has gone a long, long way beyond the actual forest lands. As I stated before, I believe the time will come when the agricultural lands will be open for entry, and will not be allowed to remain in forest reserves.

I approve this appropriation; I voted for it in committee, and I shall vote for it in the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, unfortunately I was absent from the Senate on other matters during the early discussion of this item; but I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. I understand that where the bill speaks of "general expenses, Forest Service," it is intended to cover expenditures for fire.

Mr. OVERMAN. Fire fighting. It is in addition to the \$250,000 appropriated for this purpose for the year beginning July 1, 1914.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Can the chairman inform us as to the items making up this expenditure?

Mr. OVERMAN. No item except one—so many employees at 25 cents an hour.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. How many?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would take 25,000 men, working a month apiece, to make up this amount.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Has the Senator any notion that that condition of affairs existed? Was there anything before the committee, in the estimate or otherwise, to show what items entered into that expenditure?

Here is my reason for asking the question: I suppose we provide, in the general Agricultural bill, for a staff in the Forestry Service which will be used in fighting fires. I am curious to know how they could incur an extra expense to the amount of \$400,000 for performing the service for which their department is already organized. The Senator says they pay 25 cents an hour.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is the way it was spent. The Senator will find from the hearings that that is the only estimate that was given. The men were employed at 25 cents an hour. That is the way the money was expended.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Has the Senator gone into the matter to ascertain how many men it would take and for how long in fighting fire?

Mr. OVERMAN. It would be \$2 a day for one man. It would take 300,000 men a day, or 30,000 men 10 days. The Senator can make the calculation as well as I can.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I wanted to know whether this was just a lump sum, or whether it was appropriated as we have been accustomed to appropriate for the Forestry Service, without detailed specifications as to what it was for; that is all.

Mr. OVERMAN. All we know is that we appropriated \$250,000 upon their estimate, and six months thereafter they come in here with a request for \$371,000 more, saying that they have used this money, have spent it in employing men to fight fires, and it was not much of a fire year.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Idaho having been withdrawn, the Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill, and read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.
BUREAU OF LIGHTHOUSES.

Lighthouse tender, general service: For constructing and equipping a lighthouse tender for general service, authorized by the act approved March 4, 1913, \$250,000.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, before going further I want to say just a word with reference to this item under the Lighthouse Service.

There is an item there of \$250,000 for a lighthouse tender for the Pacific coast. That is a matter in which our people have been very much interested heretofore, and the Secretary himself has urged that we need a larger boat. The Senate at the last session passed a bill increasing the limit of cost of that boat from \$250,000 to \$325,000, and such a bill was favorably reported by the committee in the House.

I offered an amendment, intended to be proposed to this bill, to increase the amount to \$325,000. I did that largely because of the action of the Senate at the previous session, and also because the Secretary of Commerce had urged this increase very strongly in his report, and had pointed out very strong reasons why it should be made.

It has developed, however, possibly even since he made his report, that conditions on the Pacific coast are such that it is very likely that a larger vessel than was contemplated originally for \$250,000 can be secured now for \$250,000; and the Secretary has assured me that it is his judgment that with this \$250,000 he can probably get a vessel that will take care of the situation as he contemplated caring for it in his recommendation for the increase in the limit of cost. Therefore I have not pressed, and will not press, the amendment I introduced for the purpose of offering it to this provision, but I desire to make this statement in the RECORD, so that the facts may be known.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Missouri if it will suit his convenience to have the Senate go into executive session now?

Mr. STONE. There is an item in the bill, Mr. President, which has been passed over.

Mr. SMOOT. One only.

Mr. STONE. I am informed that it will likely take some time in debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair can not hear the Senator.

Mr. STONE. I said that there is an item in the pending bill that has been passed over, and I am told that some Senators desire to debate that item, or some matters connected with it, possibly at some length. In view of that fact, if it is agreeable to the Senator from North Carolina—

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask that the bill may be laid aside for the purpose of going into executive session. It becomes then, as I understand, the unfinished business to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. There is no need of laying the bill aside. We can simply go into executive session.

Mr. OVERMAN. It comes up automatically. I thought probably I might move to take it up during the morning hour. It will come up automatically after 2 o'clock.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, certainly it will. This bill is now the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be well enough to notify the Senate now that unanimous consent was given to laying aside temporarily the so-called shipping bill, which was the unfinished business.

Mr. LODGE. But this bill, Mr. President, was not taken up by unanimous consent. It was taken up on motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands that. It did not affect the other bill, however.

Mr. LODGE. That displaces the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. However, that is a matter to be disposed of to-morrow.

Mr. STONE. We will dispose of that matter when we get to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What motion does the Senator make now?

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. STONE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After 55 minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1915, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 4, 1915.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL.

Martin F. Faury to be United States marshal for the district of Delaware.

POSTMASTERS.

ALASKA.

Mary A. Carroll, Treadwell.

GEORGIA.

James J. Gordy, Richland.
Robert L. Horne, Ludowici.

ILLINOIS.

Ben Campbell Allensworth, Pekin.
Joseph V. Campeggio, Ladd.
I. C. Davidson, Carthage.
W. H. Hefferan, Rockford.
Frederick D. Jay, Elmwood.

MAINE.

Joseph A. Kenney, South Paris.
Frank B. Hills, Thomaston.
John W. Hutchins, Fryeburg.

MICHIGAN.

Horatio J. Abbott, Ann Arbor.
John F. McInerney, Wyandotte.
W. L. Tinham, Northville.

MINNESOTA.

S. G. Anderson, Hutchinson.
Charles F. Cook, Austin.
Oscar T. Stromme, Elbow Lake.

TEXAS.

J. L. Sandel, Saratoga.

VIRGINIA.

John W. Kellam, Onley.
William G. Stevenson, Accomac.

REJECTION.

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate January 4, 1915.
Marjorie J. Bloom to be postmaster at Devils Lake, N. Dak.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 4, 1915.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite and eternal Spirit, source of light and life and love, our God, our Father, pardon, we beseech Thee, our infirmities; take away our sinful desires and help us to make our lives sublime by the excellence of our thought and the rectitude of our behavior, that Thy kingdom may come in all its fullness and Thy will be done in our lives, that we may hallow the name of our Father in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 2, 1915, was read and approved.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

EXCHANGE OF CERTAIN OREGON LANDS.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 49) to provide for the exchange with the State of Oregon of certain school lands and indemnity rights within the national forests of that State for an equal area of national-forest land.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. BORLAND. I rise to reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. To object to passing it without prejudice?

Mr. BORLAND. To object to the request; yes.

There is no rule we can make that is not subject to the most gross abuse, and this rule, putting bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, is as grossly abused as any rules of this House. Here is the whole first page of this calendar devoted to the titles of bills that have been passed over repeatedly without prejudice. The result is that a bill at the end of the Calendar for Unanimous Consent will have no chance of consideration at this session. Now, we are intending to-day to take up, in the consideration of the Unanimous Consent Calendar, time that, considering the limited time that we have, ought to be devoted to appropriation bills, and gentlemen are going to get up here and argue over these propositions on this first page as to whether the bills shall or shall not be passed without prejudice. Now, why do gentlemen put their bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and then repeatedly ask that they be passed without prejudice, when they know it is to the prejudice of every other Member in the House even to make such a request?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill under consideration was the subject of discussion two weeks ago, but was passed over in order that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] and myself might get together on an amendment. I have just returned to the city this morning and we have not been able to come to any

agreement on the amendment, so the gentleman, so as not to take up any time in the consideration of it, immediately asked to have it passed over without prejudice. If these other bills are passed over as promptly as the gentleman from Oregon attempted to get this one passed over this morning, it will not interfere with the consideration of bills at the bottom of the calendar.

Mr. BORLAND. I have no disposition to prejudice the gentleman from Oregon; but if he asks that the bill be passed without prejudice it ought to be accompanied by a request that it go to the heel of the docket, and give everybody else a fair chance at this calendar. I have not a single bill on this calendar, so I feel perfectly free to speak about it. The gentleman has no right to hold the head of the calendar day after day with a bill that he is going to ask to have passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] asks that this bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Is the gentleman from Indiana going to object?

Mr. COX. No; I am not going to object.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] objected to passing the bill without prejudice. Did anyone object to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARNER. No one objected to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, may we have it reported first?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it. The Chair will make the same request of the House that he made a year ago, and that is that when the title of a bill is read, if any gentleman has made up his mind resolutely to object to it, let him object then.

Mr. GARNER. What are you going to do? Are you going to object?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are going to consider it now.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SINNOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be passed over and go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over and go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to that request.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I do not believe that is a good practice to begin.

Mr. BORLAND. Then let it go off. Unanimous consent is a special privilege, anyway.

Mr. MANN. Why, certainly. I am not complaining if the gentleman objects. The same thing will apply to a number of other bills.

Mr. BORLAND. I am willing that the bill be considered now. If it can not be considered now, it has no place on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. The rule ought to be that if a bill is passed over it shall go to the bottom of the calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says he is not ready to consider it to-day, but will be in two weeks.

Mr. BORLAND. Then it ought not to be on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects to the request that it be passed without prejudice and go to the foot of the calendar, and the Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of certain Members on this side, I will object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the

bill (H. R. 6060) to regulate the immigration of aliens to and the residence of aliens in the United States, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bill of the following titles:

On December 22, 1914:

S. J. Res. 213. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House to pay the officers and employees of the Senate and House, including the Capitol police, their respective salaries for the month of December, 1914, on the 22d day of said month.

On December 23, 1914:

S. 94. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

INVESTIGATION OF ACCOUNTS UNDER RECLAMATION ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 124) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and settle certain accounts under the reclamation acts, and for other purposes.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have no disposition to object to the bill of my friend from California; but what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and I shall have to object. We ought to treat both sides of this House exactly alike.

Mr. RAKER. I did not catch exactly what the gentleman said about sauce for the gander, but when this bill was called up a while ago the gentleman from Illinois objected, and I was having certain matters investigated, and I will have it ready at the next meeting.

Mr. BORLAND. Let me call attention to the fact that this bill has been up several times and a little debate had upon it each time, and at each time the gentleman said he was going to straighten out the difficulty, and had it passed without prejudice. And I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects to the request that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this is too important a bill to be considered to-day, and I therefore feel obliged to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16056) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Grand Junction, Colo.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Grand Junction, Colo., be, and the same hereby is, increased from the sum of \$100,000 to the sum of \$250,000, said increase to be employed in the enlargement and betterment of the building.

The following committee amendment was read:

In line 5, page 1, strike out the figures "\$250,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$175,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Reserving the right to object, I would like to hear something about the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I have asked to have this bill passed over once or twice before, because there are a number of other bills of the same kind on the calendar increasing the authorization of certain buildings. The city of Grand Junction got an appropriation for a public building several years ago, but never has been able to build the building or obtain a bid that was satisfactory to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department, because of the insufficiency of the appropriation. This is to increase the appropriation to the extent of \$75,000. The building can not be built until Congress makes this additional appropriation. There are five or six Government departments or offices in that town besides the post office—the Reclamation Service, with a large force of officials, the Forest Service, Weather Bureau, Civil Service Commission, Department of Justice, and the drainage department, and a large number of those Government officials are now housed in various places over the city. The Government is paying nearly \$3,000 a year in rent, and the officials of the Government are desirous of having this building built at once. The site was purchased some 8 or 10 years ago, and the city has been waiting all this time for this building. As a matter of fact, this is being urged

by the Treasury Department, and we feel if there is any building in the country that ought to be provided for at this session of Congress, making appropriations of this kind so as to prevent further delay and inconvenience to the Federal employees, this is one of them. If none of these bills are going to be allowed to pass, of course I expect to take my medicine and wait, the same as the rest; but if the policy is to pass any of them, I want to insist on this one being considered by the House. We want to be treated the same as others, especially as this is one of the most meritorious of these bills before the House.

Mr. SHERLEY. I know of no program to kill bills, and I do not propose to be a party to any such thing, but here is a bill increasing by a large sum the limit of cost of a public building. My experience is that nearly every public-building allowance ought to be cut down instead of increasing it, and that has been accentuated every time I have made examination into a specific case. I have not had a chance to examine the bill or report in this case. How many people are there in this town?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Something like 8,000 people in the city proper, but there are 15,000 people immediately adjacent and who are patrons of these offices. That is according to the report of the department. The post-office receipts of the post office for the year 1913 were nearly \$35,000. This is a wealthy country, the center of a large fruit-growing country in western Colorado. It is at the junction and division point of three railroads, and is the metropolis of western Colorado, the largest and most important city in the western half of the State.

Mr. SHERLEY. Does the United States own the land?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and has for some 8 or 10 years.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is to be the size of the building?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We will have 8,000 feet of floor space. That is what the department reports that the Government needs right now.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is the character of the building to be?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. This increase only provides for a brick building. The inhabitants of that city feel that they are entitled to a marble building, because it is near the marble quarry that is furnishing the marble for the Lincoln Memorial in this city and upon which we are to spend \$2,000,000. This marble comes from right near this place, and if we could have a suitable appropriation made for it we would like to have the Government use our marble; but this additional \$75,000 only authorizes a brick building, with a floor space that will provide for the Government necessities now and will not make any provision for growth. It is merely to take care of the Government officials there now without any place of abode.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; certainly.

Mr. HAMLIN. What was the original appropriation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. HAMLIN. And you want \$75,000 additional?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; the Treasury Department insists that it ought to have \$100,000 additional, but the Public Building Committee have only authorized an increase of \$75,000, so we are asking that sum. I may say that the Senate has passed a similar bill making a \$100,000 increase. The Senate bill is on this calendar, and if consent is given to take this bill up, I will ask to have the Senate bill substituted for the House bill.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, when they originally provided for this building they only provided for a post office?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is all.

Mr. MANN. And since then they find they need room for many other governmental services?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; because the reclamation project is now there with a large force of Government officials, and they have the forest reserve service of a large part of western Colorado, and they have the drainage service of the Reclamation Service, and a number of other Federal functions are established there.

Mr. MANN. The Weather Bureau.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. And that is the reason for the increase?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir. That is the reason the increase is necessary.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. And the Federal court is there.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; but I have a bill pending to create a term of the Federal court at this city, but this bill does not provide for a Federal court. Whenever they get that court there they will have to have an enlargement of the building.

Mr. SHERLEY. What is the good of passing this bill if immediately after getting the authorization you are to come in for an increase?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There is no immediate prospect for the passage of that bill. We may not pass it for a number of years yet. We do not want to wait until we get that bill passed, which probably will not be until we get another Federal judge, and I do not know when that will be. We do not wish to wait for that. We have been waiting for nearly 10 years now, and we feel we are certainly entitled to the passage of this bill, and I do hope Congress will allow it to pass at this session, because we have been so long patiently waiting for this building and the department has so earnestly recommended its construction.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, there is absolutely nothing in this report which I can gather from a hasty reading showing why you need 8,000 square feet of floor space. The statement is made that that amount of space is needed—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is made by the Supervising Architect, is it not?

Mr. SHERLEY. I understand so, but that is just the trouble. The statement of the Supervising Architect in the Treasury Department may be upon a basis which would not be agreed to by any business man in expending his own money. Now here you are asking for an increase of nearly 100 per cent in the cost of the building in a report which says you need 8,000 square feet, but why you need it is a question for the House to consider, and the report does not give any information. It simply says—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. What higher authority can you get for this than the Government's Supervising Architect?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will tell the gentleman what higher authority you can get, and that is the facts upon which the Supervising Architect bases his conclusion—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We have got those facts in the hearings.

Mr. SHERLEY. And then determine whether his conclusion is wise or not, but when you simply give the conclusion without the facts, then we are thrown back upon the Supervising Architect's Office, and I for one am not willing to trust its judgment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The Supervising Architect came before the committee and his statement is in the hearings.

Mr. SHERLEY. That may be all true, but they do not appear here in the report.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. We do not put all the hearings in the report.

Mr. SHERLEY. But the report should contain an adequate summary. The gentleman is asking a special procedure, to get the bill up here, and the moment it is gotten up it passes; we all know that.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Connecticut rise?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I again desire to reserve the right to object in order to get some information, if the gentleman from Connecticut will permit it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman from Kentucky, I did not believe it necessary for me to put our hearings before the committee in the report. I gave the substance of what these various governmental functions are and what each one of them is doing, and anybody who will look into the matter will see that the governmental functions that are at that city will require a large amount of space. They are largely in the agricultural development line, and I feel that in the report of the committee and with the hearings and with the synopsis I have given here and the long delay this city has been put to—we have advertised three times and we have not and never can get a building unless there is an additional appropriation, and when the department urges Congress to give \$100,000, I feel that we are certainly safe in authorizing an additional \$75,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois permit the bill to go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. MADDEN. No; I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill is ordered stricken from the calendar.

VALIDATING LOCATION OF PHOSPHATE-ROCK DEPOSITS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 6106) validating locations of deposits of phosphate rock heretofore made in good faith under the placer-mining laws of the United States.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been included as an amendment to a bill already passed, and as it is pending in the Senate I ask unanimous consent to pass the bill over without prejudice.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if that is the case, why is it necessary to pass it over?

Mr. FRENCH. Because we do not know what its fate will be in the Senate.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects, and the bill is ordered stricken from the calendar.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I objected to this being passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman objects to its being passed without prejudice. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FRENCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to consider the bill in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That where public lands containing deposits of phosphate rock have heretofore been located in good faith under the placer-mining laws of the United States, such locations shall be valid and may be perfected under the provisions of said placer-mining laws, and such locations shall give title and possession to such deposits. This act shall apply to such locations heretofore patented: *Provided,* That this act shall not apply to any locations made subsequent to the withdrawal of such lands from location, nor shall it apply to lands included in an adverse or conflicting lode location unless such adverse or conflicting location is abandoned.

With the following committee amendments:

First. Page 1, line 5, after the words "United States," insert "and upon which assessment work has been annually performed."

Second. Page 1, line 7, strike out the words "such locations" and insert "patents whether heretofore or hereafter issued thereon."

Third. Page 1, line 8, after the word "title," insert the word "to."

Fourth. Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "to" and insert the word "of" in lieu thereof.

Fifth. Page 1, lines 8 and 9, amend by striking out the period and the words "This act shall apply to such locations heretofore patented."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bills as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FRENCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

NAVEL-ORANGE INDUSTRY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House Joint Resolution 302, authorizing and directing the President of the United States to invite foreign Governments to participate in the celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Washington navel-orange industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects, and the resolution is stricken from the calendar.

POST-OFFICE BUILDING AT WALTHAM, MASS.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13489) increasing the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the construction thereon of a post office at Waltham, Mass.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to hear something about it. [After a pause.] If there is no explanation, I feel that I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

KING THEOLOGICAL HALL, HOWARD UNIVERSITY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 5168) for the relief of the King Theological Hall, and authorizing the conveyance of real estate to the Howard University and other grantees.

The Clerk read the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

POST OFFICE AT SEYMOUR, IND.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18172) to increase the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

That the limit of cost of the United States post-office building at Seymour, Ind., be, and the same is hereby, increased \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary to meet the additional cost of construction of said building by the substitution of stone instead of brick with stone trimmings, as specified in the existing specification.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have some explanation of the bill.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dixon is the author of this bill, and it is for a post-office building site in his district. He is unable to be here to-day. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice until he is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to pass the bill without prejudice? Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I will have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to its being passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri objects to its being passed without prejudice. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, my sole purpose is to find out something about the size of the post office and the necessity of the change from brick to stone, increasing the cost generally. It is pretty generally understood that we are to have no public-buildings bill at this session, and I have had some experience with matters of this kind—not that I know anything about this proposition or that I have any particular objection to it. I merely want a reasonable explanation of the bill, what amount was originally appropriated, and the necessity for an increase in the cost of \$15,000.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give the gentleman that information.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Indiana will yield, I do not think it is very difficult to understand the bill.

Mr. CULLOP. I suppose the report shows that.

Mr. MANN. There is no controversy about the need for the building. That has been provided for. Indiana is a great producer of building stone, and under the original appropriation it was proposed to build a brick building right in the midst of a stone-producing territory.

Mr. CULLOP. Yes; it is within 20 miles only of the great stone-producing belt.

Mr. MANN. Which is an anomaly. I think where they produce stone they ought to have a stone building.

Mr. FINLEY. I was not aware of that fact. I have no objection to the bill, but merely wish some explanation.

Mr. CULLOP. That is the fact about it. It is within 20 miles.

Mr. SHERLEY. If it is so close to Bedford, why could not they get the stone shipped?

Mr. MANN. I do not know why; but it seems to me they can not. I believe in lots of places we ought to put up brick buildings, but I would not do it in the Bedford-stone district, because it would make everybody there sore.

Mr. CULLOP. The department always puts out three bids, and one of them is for brick and one is for stone; and the stone is a little more costly, of course, than the brick. But this is right in the heart of the stone belt, and the building ought to be constructed out of the neolithic limestone which is a product of that district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CULLOP, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ASSAY OFFICE, NEW YORK CITY.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3342) for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under the authority contained in the acts of Congress approved March 4, 1911, and August 26, 1912, for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in New York City, and for vaults therefor, and architectural, engineering, and other technical services in connection therewith, are hereby reappropriated and made available for the erection of a new fireproof building on said Wall Street front, in continuation, or extension, of the present assay office building fronting on Pine Street, together with suitable vaults for use of said assay office and the adjoining Subtreasury, and, if necessary, an entrance from or connection with said Subtreasury for access therefrom, at a total limit of cost of not exceeding in the aggregate the present limits of cost for building, vaults, connection with the Subtreasury, and the architectural, engineering, or other technical services in connection therewith, of \$607,408.

SEC. 2. That the authority heretofore given to the Secretary of the Treasury to employ, in his discretion, such architectural, engineering, or other technical services as he may deem necessary in connection with the enlargement, remodeling, or extension of the portion of the assay office in New York City fronting on Wall Street, and to pay for such services from the unexpended balance of the appropriation from which the rear portion of said assay office was constructed, is hereby continued with respect to said new building, payment therefor within the limit heretofore fixed to be made from the amounts herein reappropriated.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, further authorized to employ in connection with the Supervising Architect's Office, and without regard to the civil-service laws, rules, or regulations for service, either within or without the District of Columbia, such other specially skilled technical, engineering, consulting, and superintending services as he may deem necessary all such specially skilled technical, engineering, consulting, and superintending services to be exclusively employed in connection with the plans and specifications for said vaults and the foundations of said building and vaults. And the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay for such services mentioned in this paragraph such compensation and such actual necessary traveling and subsistence expenses in connection with such work as he may deem reasonable, from the amounts herein reappropriated; all such additional services and traveling expenses heretofore authorized to be in addition to and independent of the authorizations and appropriations for personal services and traveling expenses in said office otherwise made.

And in razing said Wall Street front the Secretary of the Treasury may dispose, by gift or otherwise, of the facade of said present building with a view to the preservation of said facade: *Provided*, That the United States shall not be put to any expense beyond that for said razing.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the words "reappropriated and" and insert the words "authorized to be."

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BORLAND. What has become of Calendar No. 318?

The SPEAKER. The bill was passed on December 21.

Mr. BORLAND. Passed when?

The SPEAKER. Passed the House on December 21.

Mr. BORLAND. It is still on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. It ought not to have been on the calendar. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill S. 3342?

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. MOORE. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] who is sponsor for this bill—

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not sponsor for the bill. It was introduced by my colleague, Mr. CANTOR. The item was sent to the Committee on Appropriations in some estimates a year ago, and as it was a legislative matter the item was transferred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MOORE. I see that the limit of appropriations here would be a little in excess of \$600,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. What the bill does is this: Three hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars was appropriated to build vaults in the assay office; \$270,000 was appropriated to remodel the existing assay office, a two-story building. The front is one of the few historic fronts and fine pieces of architecture in the city of New York. The Treasury Department ascertains that as it is impossible to do the remodeling and to preserve the front legislation is desired to permit the expenditure of the money to erect a new building instead of remodeling the present one.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman quite correct? Was not \$322,000 appropriated for the purpose of building vaults under this building?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And they found they could not do that?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No; they did not find they could not do that.

Mr. MANN. That is what they reported. I do not know what they found.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a mistake.

Mr. MANN. And they could reconstruct the building with vaults at no greater expense than it would cost to build the vaults by themselves?

Mr. FITZGERALD. That is a mistake. Three hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars were appropriated for the vaults. Two hundred and seventy thousand dollars were appropriated to make certain changes in the Subtreasury. That plan was abandoned and that money was made available to remodel the assay office. The Treasury Department states now that it can make a better job by constructing a new building instead of remodeling the old one. The Secretary desires authority to take down the front in such a way that it can be preserved and donated to some historical society; the additional legislation is to employ the technical services required in connection with the support of a very large building which adjoins the present site.

Mr. MOORE. There is an increase in the work of the assay office in New York due to recent legislation, is there not?

Mr. FITZGERALD. An increase in the work?

Mr. MOORE. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I do not think so.

Mr. MOORE. Certain other branches of the work have been consolidated?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The work of the New York Assay Office is almost wholly confined to the importations of gold from foreign countries. That is the principal work done there. When gold is brought here in bars or in bullion, or in whatever form, it is assayed there, because it has to be paid into the Treasury. That is the chief assay work in New York. Work is not taken from other cities to New York. It is the work that has always been there, and it is due to the very large importation of gold to New York.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman explain the necessity for employing outside architects on this work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The outside architects who are to be employed are not for the work on the building, but in the city of New York in erecting very large buildings a special class of engineers has been developed for the subaqueous work.

Most of the foundations of these buildings in New York are below the sea level, and the engineering work requires the service of engineers who are sufficiently skilled in shoring up and supporting buildings of 8, 10, or more stories, similar to the office building which adjoins the site, to undertake the work.

Mr. MOORE. This provision is not necessarily due to the fact that the Supervising Architect's office in Washington is overcrowded with work?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No. It is due to the fact that there is no one connected with the Government service who is sufficiently familiar with that class of work to undertake it.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague permit an interruption?

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Secretary of the Treasury stated that arrangements had been made with the engineer who had built the Hudson Terminal Building, one of the very largest buildings in the city, to do the work for 2½ per cent of the cost of the work, the regular fee being 5 per cent.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, I have been through the building, and my attention was particularly called to the fact that these engineers were necessary, in view of the fact that the Government had no men who were familiar with that kind of work. I have had experience in that particular line of work, and I know that there are certain kinds of engineers in our city who make that work a specialty. The building adjoining is 20 stories high, and it is important to the owners and to the Government that we should adopt this policy.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The site is valued at about a million dollars.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no connection between this bill and the one that was passed at the instance of Mr. CANTOR at the last session?

Mr. FITZGERALD. This is Mr. CANTOR's bill. He did not get it through. It was objected to, as I understand.

Mr. FINLEY. I was here, and that is not my recollection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He had the bill up, but objection was made to it. But this is a Senate bill.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, at the last session the gentleman from New York [Mr. CANTOR] had a bill passed, though I am not sure whether it was for this particular purpose or to improve the subtreasury.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is the same bill.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, the House passed a bill like this—a House bill. This is a Senate bill, but it is the same thing. House bill No. 13296 was passed.

Mr. FINLEY. I was satisfied that the same bill was passed here on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. That was the House bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. FINLEY. I hardly see how the bill got back here.

Mr. MANN. This is a Senate bill, covering the same thing as the House bill that was passed. One body or the other has to pass the bill first.

Mr. FINLEY. One other question, Mr. Speaker. What is the urgency for the passage of this bill at this time?

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have the money; they have authority to rebuild the existing building.

Mr. FINLEY. And the appropriation has not lapsed?

Mr. FITZGERALD. It has not lapsed, and it would be much better for the Government to tear the building down and put up a new building, and at the same time, give an opportunity to preserve the front, which is one of the finest pieces of architecture in the city of New York.

Mr. FINLEY. It is simply to change the plans and specifications?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes. It is simply to put up a new building in place of remodeling the old building.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment ought not to be agreed to. It is evidently a mistake. The money was appropriated and the bill as passed by the Senate provided that it should be reappropriated and made available. The amendment struck out "reappropriated" and provided that it should be authorized to be made available. That would not amount to anything. And then, on page 3, line 13, they refer to the money as being "herein reappropriated," so that the amendment that was proposed was an accidental error, apparently.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The amendment was due to the fact that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds did not wish to appear as directly appropriating money.

Mr. MANN. But the only thing to do is to reappropriate the money and make it available. The amendment should be disagreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FITZGERALD, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS NIAGARA RIVER AT LEWISTON, N. Y.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 16640) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Niagara River, in the town of Lewiston, in the county of Niagara, and State of New York.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object to the present consideration of this bill, I would like if it could be passed over without prejudice for the reason that my colleague, Mr. GITTINGS, is unable to be present to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. What is the request, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The request was that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is present, and he has been adopting a very consistent course in objecting this morning to passing over bills without prejudice. I do not know whether he intends now to change his policy or not.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman want to object?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I do not; but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the gentleman has adopted a very inconsistent position.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. STAFFORD. No; the gentleman is not mistaken. The gentleman objected to passing over a public-building bill awhile ago when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CULLOP] was absent.

Mr. BORLAND. I object to the request to pass the bill over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I shall object to its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar, and the Clerk will report the next one.

RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17894) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by compelling common carriers engaged in interstate commerce to equip their locomotives with safe and suitable boilers and appurtenances thereto," approved February 17, 1911, shall apply to and include the entire locomotive and tender and all parts and appurtenances thereof.

SEC. 2. That the chief inspector and the two assistant chief inspectors, together with all the district inspectors, appointed under the act of February 17, 1911, shall inspect and shall have the same powers and duties with respect to all the parts and appurtenances of the locomotive and tender that they now have with respect to the boiler of a locomotive and the appurtenances thereof, and the said act of February 17, 1911, shall apply to and include the entire locomotive and tender and all their parts with the same force and effect as it now applies to locomotive boilers and their appurtenances. That upon the passage of this act all inspectors and applicants for the position of inspector shall be examined touching their qualifications and fitness with respect to the additional duties imposed by this act.

SEC. 3. That nothing in this act shall be held to alter, amend, change, repeal, or modify any other act of Congress than the said act of February 17, 1911, to which reference is herein specifically made, or any order of the Interstate Commerce Commission promulgated under the safety-appliance act of March 2, 1893, and supplemental acts, except that for a violation of the act of February 17, 1911, as hereby amended, or of any rule or regulation made under its provisions, or of any lawful order of any inspector acting thereunder, the offender shall be subject to prosecution by the United States for a penalty under said act, as hereby amended, only: *Provided*, That the passage of this act shall not affect any suit pending or offense committed prior to the passage hereof.

SEC. 4. That this act shall take effect six months after its passage, except as otherwise herein provided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Georgia rise?

Mr. BARTLETT. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, this may entail an expense upon the Government by the appointment of additional employees in all probability, and it may be necessary to consider it in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. It proposes examinations and appoints men to perform certain duties, who doubtless will have to be paid a salary.

Mr. MANN. I do not think this is a Union Calendar bill. While it provides for an inspection of locomotives, broader than is now provided for by law, it does not increase the number of inspectors or their salaries, but authorizes the same inspectors to make the inspection.

Mr. GOEKE. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. MANN. In a moment. When we pass a law making an act a criminal act, we know that if anybody is accused of the crime it will involve an expense to the Government, but that does not make it a Union Calendar bill, because it does not increase the number of officials of the Government drawing pay, although it may increase the number of jurors. Now, this bill simply broadens the power of the inspectors who are already provided for by law. I do not think that makes it a Union Calendar bill.

Mr. ADAMSON. It provides for an examination.

Mr. BARTLETT. I merely call it to the attention of the Speaker to let the Speaker decide.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. I wish to remind the gentleman from Illinois, in corroboration of what he says, that it appears that the machinery already exists. There is no extension of the machinery.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman arguing the point of order?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will decide, without argument, that the bill is on the right calendar. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GOEKE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

OLD POST OFFICE, JERSEY CITY, N. J.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9584) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to sell the present old post office and the site thereof in the city of Jersey City, N. J.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the completion of the new Federal building at Jersey City, N. J., and its occupancy by the United States, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to sell the present old post office and site thereof in said city, after proper advertisement, at public or private sale, on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States to execute a quitclaim deed to the purchaser thereof, and to deposit the proceeds of said sale in the Treasury of the United States as a miscellaneous receipt.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the words "sell the present old post office and site thereof in said city, after proper advertisement, at public or private sale, on such terms as he may deem to be to the best interests of the United States" and insert "offer at public sale, after proper advertisement, the present old post office and site in said city, and sell the same to the highest and best bidder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to understand the necessity for this proposed change of verbiage.

Mr. HAMILL. Mr. Speaker, it was at the request of the board of education of Jersey City that this bill was introduced. Jersey City now has a new post office.

Mr. FINLEY. I understand that.

Mr. HAMILL. They want to procure the old post-office site for a public school. They wanted to make a private arrangement with the Secretary of the Treasury to sell the property at private sale. The bill was presented to the committee, and for a time it looked as if they were perfectly willing to have the building sold by an arrangement between the board of education and the Secretary of the Treasury; but somebody thought that it would look better if the building were sold at public sale, and so this amendment was suggested, that the Secretary of the Treasury sell it at public sale.

Mr. FINLEY. Under the bill as it was originally drawn the Secretary of the Treasury could sell on such terms as he wished.

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. That would apply to the sale, the amount to be paid, the deferred payments, and so on. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Under this amendment the Secretary of the Treasury would be limited to the consideration of cash bids. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HAMILL. Yes; I think so.

Mr. FINLEY. Does the gentleman think that would probably be for the best interests of the Government?

Mr. HAMILL. I will say that if the gentleman wishes to offer any amendment with regard to the sale, I am perfectly willing to accept it.

Mr. FINLEY. My view is that the words "on such terms as he may prescribe and for the best interests of the Government" should be inserted in the amendment. I have no objection to the bill, and I am only suggesting that it may be found to be for the best interests of the Government to leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. In other words, under the original bill you could sell on time, for part cash, while the amendment would confine the Secretary of the Treasury to a cash sale. I have no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, there is no information contained in the report on this bill. Does the gentleman from New Jersey think this is a very good time to sell real estate?

Mr. HAMILL. Let me explain the whole situation with regard to the bill. Jersey City some time ago—

Mr. MANN. That information ought to have been contained in the report.

Mr. HAMILL. The committee thought otherwise, and so far as this particular piece of property is concerned it is as good a time as there ever will be to sell it.

Mr. MANN. Is this property liable to become any more valuable?

Mr. HAMILL. No; it is not. It is likely to become less valuable—

Mr. MANN. Then it would be a crime to impose upon some poor ignorant sucker now.

Mr. HAMILL. The board of education of Jersey City intend to purchase it for a public school. It is in a neighborhood that is going down so far as the purchase of property is concerned, but it is a place where a school is badly needed, and the property is located exceptionally for school purposes. There is a small park on one side of the building and a street on the other, giving a good light, and that is the reason for the introduction of this bill.

Mr. MANN. You seem to have a customer already; how much have they offered for the property?

Mr. HAMILL. They have made no offer yet.

Mr. MANN. I think we had better wait until they make an offer.

Mr. HAMILL. Will the gentleman from Illinois consent that it be passed over without prejudice?

Mr. MANN. As far as I am concerned.

Mr. HAMILL. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice and retained on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

COINAGE OF COINS FOR THE PANAMA EXPOSITION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill S. 6039, an act for the coinage of certain gold and silver coins in commemoration of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be coined at the United States mint at San Francisco not exceeding 2,000 gold coins of the denomination of \$50 each, 10,000 gold coins of the denomination of \$2.50 each, 25,000 gold coins of the denomination of \$1 each, and not exceeding 200,000 silver coins of the denomination of 50 cents each, all of legal weight and fineness; said coins to be struck in commemoration of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. The words, devices, and designs upon said coins shall be determined and prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and all provisions of law relative to the coinage and legal-tender value of all other gold and silver coins shall be applicable to the coins issued under and in accordance with the provisions of this act; and one-half of the issue of \$50 gold coins herein authorized shall be similar in shape to the octagonal \$50 gold pieces issued in California in 1851; and the entire issue of said \$50, \$2.50, and \$1 coins herein authorized shall be sold and delivered by the Secretary of the Treasury to the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. at par, under rules and regulations and in amounts to be prescribed by him, the delivery of said coins to begin not later than December 1, 1914. Said 50-cent coins herein authorized shall be issued only upon the request of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co., and shall be delivered to it by the Secretary of the Treasury, at par, during the period when said Panama-Pacific International Exposition shall be officially open.

Sec. 2. That medals and diplomas, with appropriate devices, emblems, and inscriptions commemorative of said Panama-Pacific International Exposition and of the awards to be made to the exhibitors thereat, shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury at the United States mint at Philadelphia and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, said medals and diplomas to be delivered to said Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. subject to the provisions of section 52 of the coinage act of 1873 and upon payment of the cost of the material composing said medals or diplomas.

Sec. 3. That the 50-cent silver coins herein authorized may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury, be coined or finished and issued from the machinery to be installed as a part of the exhibit of the United States mint at said exposition, and for the purpose of maintaining the exhibit as an educative working exhibit at all times the coins so minted may be remelted and reminted. All of said 50-cent silver coins herein authorized not issued to and at the request of said Panama-Pacific International Exposition, whether the same are coined as a part of said working exhibit or coined at the mint in San Francisco, shall be remelted upon the official closing of said exposition. All provisions hereof in regard to the coinage, finishing, or issue of said 50-cent silver coins from machinery installed as a part of the said exhibit shall be coined, finished, and issued under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe; and the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be prepared a suitable souvenir medal (of such metal or composition of metals as he may prescribe), to be struck off by the machinery in said mint exhibit, and all of said medals shall be delivered to said Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. upon payment of the cost of the material composing the same, and all other souvenirs which may be coined, stamped, printed, or otherwise issued from any portion of the United States Government exhibit shall be delivered to said exposition company upon payment of the cost of the material composing said souvenirs, and said souvenir medals and other souvenirs shall be delivered to said Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. subject to such regulations as to disposition thereof as the Government exhibit board may prescribe. All provisions, whether penal or otherwise, of the laws prohibiting the counterfeiting or imitating of coins or securities of the United States shall apply to the medals, diplomas, and souvenirs provided for under sections 2 and 3 of this act.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to obtain suitable designs for the coins and medals herein authorized, and the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray the cost of said designs.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof "three."

Page 2, after line 17, insert the words "the coinage shall be executed as soon as may be and."

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out the words "December 1, 1914," and insert in lieu thereof "the day of the opening of the exposition."

Page 5, line 2, insert the words "Provided, That the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. shall reimburse the Treasury Department for the amount thus expended."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were considered and agreed to.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out, in line 1, page 2, the dollar sign before the figures "50."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the dollar sign before the figures "50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ASHBROOK, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

OIL OR GAS LANDS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15661) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to lease to the occupants thereof certain unpatented lands on which oil or gas has been discovered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon relinquishment or surrender to the United States, within six months from the date of this act, by any locator or his successors in interest of his or their claim to any unpatented oil or gas lands included in an order of withdrawal, upon which oil or gas had been discovered, was being produced, or upon which drilling operations were in actual progress January 1, 1914, and the claim to which land was initiated prior to July 3, 1910, the Secretary of the Interior shall lease to such locator or his successors in interest the said lands so relinquished, not exceeding, however, the maximum area of 2,560 acres to any one person, association, or corporation, said leases to be conditioned upon the payment by the lessee of a royalty of not exceeding one-eighth of the oil or gas extracted or produced from the leased premises or the proceeds thereof, each lease to be for a period of 20 years, with the preferential right in the lessee to renew the same for succeeding periods of 10 years, upon such reasonable terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts, and make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect, and all leases or assignments of leases shall be subject to such rules and regulations, and the failure of any lessee or of his successor or successors to comply with the terms and conditions of the lease shall work a forfeiture of the same, to be declared by a court of competent jurisdiction.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out, after the word "Interior," line 11, page 1, the word "shall," and insert in lieu thereof the words "may in his discretion."

Strike out, after the word "of," line 1, page 2, the words "two thousand five hundred and sixty" and insert in lieu thereof "six hundred and forty." After the word "lease," on line 12, page 1, insert "on such reasonable terms and conditions as he may prescribe."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when the general leasing bill was passed it contained the provisions of this bill and a bill that was introduced by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. FRENCH]. The general leasing bill has gone to the Senate, but the calendar is quite congested over there, and there is some objection to it, and we do not know when it will pass. The House very generously let the gentleman from Idaho through with his bill, and I wondered if the gentleman from Illinois would not grant this bill the same courtesy, because they stand on the same status. Both have been passed by the Senate, both passed the House as a part of the leasing bill, and both appear on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. All that the gentleman says is true, but he has not stated all of the truth.

Mr. FERRIS. Then the gentleman can supplement any part that I have omitted.

Mr. MANN. The bill that we passed, now pending in the Senate, is the only bill that we have on that subject, and if that does not pass we have no law at all. In reference to the oil and gas lands, we have passed a law that is now on the statute

books giving the Secretary of the Interior authority to make arrangements and dispose of oil and gas on the lands, putting it in quite a different situation from the other.

Mr. FERRIS. Of course; but I thought that the gentleman might let this go through the same as he did the other.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, it is true that we passed a temporary bill having to do with cases where oil had been developed or where it was difficult to dispose of the product, but that bill does not cover all of the cases which require legislative action. This bill covers some cases that are not in any way affected by the former legislation. In view of the fact that the general legislation pending in the Senate may not pass I hope the gentleman from Illinois will not object to this going over if he is disposed to object to its consideration.

Mr. MANN. I have read in the Attorney General's report that there is a probability of various questions in reference to oil and gas lands being settled at an early day by the Supreme Court. I think it would be wiser under the circumstances, having passed a temporary bill, where the rights of all parties can be preserved—I think it would be wiser to await the permanent legislation until we know what the rights of the respective parties are under the decision of the courts.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not want the gentleman from Illinois to labor under a misapprehension. The legislation already had does not cover all of the cases by any manner of means, nor can it cover all the cases. These are cases that need relief quite as much as cases affected by the other legislation. Of course, the gentleman can object if he sees fit, but I do not want him to object on the theory that we have already legislation on this subject covering all the cases which would be affected by the legislation.

Mr. MANN. As a matter of fact there were two bills, one for permanent legislation and one for a temporary relief. I objected to both of them, but finally upon the suggestion of various parties interested that they would not press this bill, I withdrew my objection to the other bill. Now, as soon as that is a law gentlemen say that furnishes no relief. That may be true, but that was not said at the time.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not suggest that I was one of those.

Mr. MANN. No; but the gentleman was here all the time we were discussing it.

Mr. MONDELL. I can not help what others may have said or done.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Wyoming is very quick to give information, and, as a rule, is very valuable in giving information.

Mr. MONDELL. The former legislation, as far as my constituents are concerned, is of very little value. This legislation, on the contrary, is quite important to them.

Mr. MANN. If there is any man in this House who looks out for his own constituents on every possible occasion, it is the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. I thank the gentleman very kindly for that compliment. Now, if the gentleman will follow it up by giving me the opportunity at some future time of doing something for my constituents, by agreeing that this may remain on the calendar, I will appreciate his compliment very much more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object. The gentleman from Wyoming did not make any request to pass the bill over without prejudice. I would not have objected to that.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, I think I did.

Mr. MANN. No; the gentleman did not.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. But objection has been made.

Mr. MONDELL. But the gentleman from Illinois made the objection, I understand, with the idea that no request had been made to have it go over. The gentleman can withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That rests with the gentleman from Illinois, and not the Chair.

Mr. MANN. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the Chair is in error about that. It is the constant practice where objection is made to a bill to ask unanimous consent that it remain on the calendar and be passed without prejudice.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS] submitted that request. I do also in an informal way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill under the rule can go back on the calendar if it is not objected to twice.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman from Oklahoma did make the request that the bill remain on the calendar without preju-

dice, I understood. I did not think it was necessary for me to again make that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the present occupant of the chair misunderstood. He came to the chair when the bill was being considered. Did the gentleman from Oklahoma make that request?

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wyoming is in error about my making such a request; but I would like to prefer that request at this time, and I now ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted, out of order, to make that request.

Mr. MANN. Oh, the request is in order.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to obviate any question in regard to the matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I think a bill was passed with a sort of general understanding that because it was within the provisions of the general leasing bill it would be taken up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and on account of my absence I did not have an opportunity to object to it, or I would have done so.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman realizes that another bill in the same position as this was passed?

Mr. FOSTER. I feel that this bill ought to go off the calendar, and I therefore object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

CLAIMS UNDER INDIAN DEPREDACTIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 22) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MANN (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Speaker, there is no need of reading this bill through. I suggest that the gentleman from Texas make his request to substitute the Senate bill for this.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for this bill the bill S. 2824—to strike out all after the enacting clause of this bill and substitute that bill.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman wants to ask unanimous consent that there be presented to the House Senate bill 2824, reported to the House, with the same right to object to its consideration.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bill S. 2824 may be substituted for this bill, subject to the right to object to its consideration. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Illinois would still have the right to object to its consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. I know; but I may save time if I can get some information.

Mr. MANN. It will save time to have the Senate bill read now.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman can still object to its consideration after it is read.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I shall. Is there any difference between the two bills?

Mr. MANN. There is a wide difference between the two bills. The Senate bill is quite unobjectionable, I think, while about 40 of us would object to the consideration of the House bill.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas to substitute the Senate bill 2824? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the Clerk will report Senate bill 2824.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section of paragraph 1 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"First. That in all claims for property of citizens or inhabitants of the United States, except the claims of Indians heretofore or now in tribal relations, taken or destroyed by Indians belonging to any tribe in amity with and subject to the jurisdiction of the United States without just cause or provocation on the part of the owner or agent in charge, and not returned or paid for, and in all adjudications under said act as now amended, the alienage of the claimant shall not be a defense to said claimant: *Provided*, That the privileges of this act shall not extend to any person whose property at the time of its taking was unlawfully within the Indian country: *Provided further*, That all cases heretofore filed under said act of March 3, 1891, and which have been dismissed by the court for want of proof of the citizenship of the claimant or alienage shall be reinstated and readjudicated in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the presentation of any other claims than those upon which suit has heretofore been brought in the Court of Claims: *Provided further*, That all acts and parts of acts in so far as they conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed."

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, before the Clerk reports the House amendment to the Senate bill I desire to state that in reporting the Senate bill to the House the House committee struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the House bill, which is upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar. It is the intention of the friends of the measure—and that is the desire of the Committee on Indian Affairs—to consider the Senate bill as it passed the Senate, and to vote down the amendment recommended by the committee, that amendment being the House bill, which the Clerk was proceeding to read. I ask that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. MANN. The amendment does not have to be read now.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The original Senate bill has been read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, I would like to make a short statement in respect to the subject. We have had before the House at different times various propositions to reinstate a lot of claims growing out of Indian depredations and the House has refused to pass the bill. There has been quite a conflict about it. There were a great many reasons for dismissing the claims. In some of the cases the claimants developed that they were not American citizens. There was one case of a Delegate to this House, if I recall correctly, from New Mexico.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. He was from Arizona, and his name was Campbell.

Mr. MANN. He was one of the claimants. He supposed that he was a citizen, but when the claim was tried it developed that he had never taken out citizenship papers. There were a great many cases growing out of citizenship owing to the admission of Texas where people supposed they were citizens, but under the law they were not citizens. This sort of a compromise has been reached, that the only claims that can be reinstated, as stated in the bill, are claims where the alienage of the claimants shall not be a defense to said claim. That is the only thing that is carried by the Senate bill—why the reinstatement of the claim is authorized. There are not very many of those cases, but all of them, I think, so far as I have ever investigated—and I have gone over this matter a great many times—had particular merit in them.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The report of the Department of Justice, through the Assistant Attorney General having charge of this matter, goes on to point out that in some of these cases the evidence has been developed showing the property was taken, making out a complete case.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes.

Mr. GARNER. Except for the fact that the party was not at that time, for some cause or other, under the decision of the Court of Claims, a citizen of the United States. And I might suggest another reason why I think these claims should all be put in one bill and put under the same category. There have been a number of claims passed through this House in the last 10 years, special cases that have gone through, that were no more meritorious than the general class covered by this bill.

Mr. MANN. There has never been any objection to these general bills.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Does this Senate bill permit the filing of new claims?

Mr. MANN. No.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman further—

Mr. MANN. Only those old claims filed many years ago.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. It only reinstates the old cases dismissed because they were not citizens instead of inhabitants, and I will state to the gentleman here the words "citizens" and "inhabitants" have been used for 75 years, and during all the time these depredations were committed on the frontier an inhabitant was entitled to recover the same as a citizen, but by reason of recent decisions of the courts they have struck out the word "inhabitant" and we want that restored.

Mr. FINLEY. How did that change come about, by court decision and construction?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. By construction of the courts of the country and for the reason that these people were as much entitled as citizens this bill has been drafted and recommended. The report of the committee says:

In response to a letter by the former chairman of this committee, Senator WILLIAM J. STONE, the Attorney General, through Huston Thompson, Assistant Attorney General, on March 26, 1914, stated with reference to the present bill as follows:

"As to the attitude taken with respect to bills similar to Senate bill 2824 by the Assistant Attorneys General formerly in charge of this

work, I can only say they have neither advocated nor opposed the passage of such bills, but have contented themselves with presenting the facts to Congress. All laws on this subject, commencing with the act of May 19, 1796, prior to the act of March 3, 1891, provided for the recovery by citizens and inhabitants; therefore bills proposing to remove this jurisdictional requirement do not contemplate new legislation, but merely restore a right that had previously existed.

HUSTON THOMPSON,
"Assistant Attorney General."

That is what the Assistant Attorney General says.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, will the gentleman answer this question: There is no question of interest involved in these claims, is there?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. None whatever.

Mr. FINLEY. What about attorneys' fees? To what extent is that proposition involved in this bill?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is a matter between the man who has a claim against the Government and his attorney the same as any private party.

Mr. GARNER. I will state to the gentleman that these claims are on the same basis as to attorneys' fees as all other claims that come under the Indian depredation act. The original contracts were made and suits filed, and when the Court of Claims decided that an inhabitant was not entitled to recover under that statute the claim would have to be left on the docket.

Mr. FINLEY. What are the numbers of these claims?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. They aggregate about \$300,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair get the parliamentary situation straightened out for a moment before gentlemen continue. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the reading of House amendment to Senate bill 2824 be dispensed with and that the amendment be disagreed to and that Senate bill 2824 may be considered, subject to the right of objection. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. Now the matter before the House, subject to objection, is Senate bill 2824.

Mr. FINLEY. Reserving the right to object, about what is the number of these claims?

Mr. GARNER. I do not know; but the Department of Justice, according to Mr. Thompson, special attorney, who looks after these cases, estimates about \$300,000, or not exceeding \$300,000 is my recollection.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me state to the gentleman, if the gentleman will permit, that the Attorney General reports that in his opinion, included in report submitted under date of March 26, 1914, that the probable increased liability, if this amendment was adopted, would be about \$300,000.

Mr. FINLEY. And the claimants, I presume, a majority are long since dead?

Mr. GARNER. A great many of them are; yes.

Mr. FINLEY. I will ask the gentleman if he has any other knowledge than that contained in the Attorney General's report?

Mr. GARNER. I will state to the gentleman from South Carolina: I know this, that a man who has acted as foreman of the grand jury, one of the most prominent citizens in the county, is not entitled to recover under this law on account of the fact that he came to this country when he was only 2 years old, and it occurred to me that this Government owed him the same protection that it owed to either the gentleman from South Carolina or myself.

Mr. FINLEY. I will ask this: Was it occasioned by changes in the immigration laws?

Mr. GARNER. It is a decision of the court, I do not know exactly the reason.

Mr. MANN. I think somebody ought to state this: A number of these Indian depredation claims which were dismissed very largely were dismissed for a great many different reasons. Now, practically this pending proposition it is understood, and if it is not so understood by any gentleman here I hope he will deny it, that if this bill passes, if it does pass, authorizing the reinstatement only where alienage is involved, that there would not be pressed any legislation for the reinstatement of any other claims.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. GARNER. I want to say for myself—I do not know how long I will remain a Member of this body—but I have agreed, and I try to carry out my agreements in good faith, I not only will not ask for them to be considered, but I will object and try to defeat them, although some of my constituents are interested in them. And there is a very good reason. I can not conceive in my mind how it is possible that anyone can urge a good objection to this Government giving the same protection to an inhabitant which it gives to one of its own citizens, whereas I can conceive where the Government is at amity with Indians there is good reason they should not be held responsible.

Mr. MANN. The claims where the question of amity arises which were dismissed I think amount to millions of dollars.

Mr. FINLEY. That is included in this bill?

Mr. MANN. That is included in this bill; and it is the understanding—and I state again—both here and in the other body, that if this bill passes the bills for the other claimants are not to be pressed.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That is as I understand it. If unanimous consent for the consideration is given now, it is limited to cases where citizenship is the sole bar.

Mr. MANN. That is the only ground upon which the claims were rejected.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the bill H. R. 22, that I called up, was a bill that I introduced several years ago, and I have done everything in my power to put it through. I see that it is impossible to do so. This is the best that we can do, and therefore I withdraw my bill and agree to the Senate bill.

Mr. FINLEY. As I understand, the gentleman from Texas is willing to take this bill without pressing the Senate bill now or hereafter?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. That is the understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill S. 2824?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like some information. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FINLEY] asked some question with reference to these probable claimants who have claims upon the Government, as to whether these are old claims that date back for a hundred years or so. There are no direct settlers living to-day, and it is only a matter of getting money out of the Treasury that goes to pay a lot of claimants' agents who have been hanging around the Capitol trying to get these claims through.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will state to the gentleman, in answer to the first part of the gentleman's question, that it was said on March 26, 1914, that the probable increased liability in this amendment, if it should be adopted, would be about \$300,000.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that. The question I want to know is, What information can the gentleman give the House in reference to the probable claims—whether they are old claims or not?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. No new claims can be filed at all. This is the end.

Mr. GARNER. If my colleague will permit me, these claims have all originated since the Civil War and most of the claimants are from 75 to 85 years of age. So far as my observation and experience go, they are largely in Texas. These claimants, or a larger portion of them, are old men still living, and there are a few cases where their heirs are still living. I do not believe there is 5 per cent of this money that will not go to the parties interested or to their descendants.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the gentleman have any objection to an amendment providing that no attorney should receive a greater compensation than 10 per cent of the amount?

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman the attorneys' fees are managed in this way: The court requests that in all of these claims the contract shall be signed by the parties, and there is an agreement as to the percentage. If the court thinks the agreement is reasonable they let them have it, and otherwise they do not.

Mr. FOSTER. The trouble is that these men go out and gather up 30 to 50 per cent of the claims and hammer the life out of Members of Congress trying to get the bills passed, and the persons who have suffered losses get nothing. The claimants wake up to the fact that these claim agents get the largest part. It is a great deal like the old French spoliation claims. They make them believe that there is a whole lot of money, whereas if they got all of it and it was divided up there would not be over \$5 apiece.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman let me read him this from the bill?—

Provided further: That all cases heretofore filed under said act of March 3, 1891, and which have been dismissed by the court for want of proof of the citizenship of the claimant or alienage shall be reinstated and readjudicated in accordance with the provisions of this act: *Provided further:* That nothing in this act shall be construed to authorize the presentation of any other claims than those upon which suit has heretofore been brought in the Court of Claims.

These are old cases, and there were very few of them. The claims do not amount to more than \$300,000.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentlemen from Illinois yield?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that I am in hearty accord with his position in reference to preventing unconscionable fees being collected, and especially where it is taking money from Indians. But here are a number of cases that were prosecuted in the Court of Claims by lawyers probably under contract with their clients for contingent fees. Now, after having gone through the courts, and finally having to go back to the courts, if this legislation is enacted, without having any information or knowledge as to what fee they are to receive, I think the gentleman will see that they ought to receive whatever fee their clients contracted to pay to them. They are not Indians, they are not incompetents, but are able to make their own contracts and ought to live up to them.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is a poor policy to vote money out of the Treasury in that way—

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri calls for the regular order. The regular order is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BORLAND. I will, if the gentleman really wants any further information.

Mr. FOSTER. I am trying to get some information.

Mr. BORLAND. All right; go ahead.

Mr. FOSTER. The only thing about these claims is this, that practically all of this \$300,000 that is estimated to be taken out of the Treasury to pay these claims is practically all to be paid out to claim agents, and I do not believe it is good policy for Congress to allow that.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I have seen a number of these contracts. Of course, I can not give testimony as to the contracts that I have not seen, but I know some of my constituents have made these contracts—made them years ago—15 or 20 years ago—and all the contracts that I have seen bear 15 per cent.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is not unreasonable.

Mr. GARNER. I want to state this fact further to the gentleman from Illinois, that these cases have nearly all been proven up. They are simply lying there awaiting the passage of this law, in order that the courts may take into consideration the facts that have all been proven in court.

I will say further that most of these cases that I have investigated show conclusively that the property was taken, and the courts have found the amount due, except that they can not render judgment on account of the condition of the law. Under these conditions I do not think that new contracts would be made by my constituents or by anybody else's constituents.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, upon the statement of my friend from Texas [Mr. GARNER] that he has seen some of these contracts, and that they call for 15 per cent—probably not an unreasonable fee—I am going to withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] withdraws his objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I very much dislike to object to this bill, and probably will not, but this is a practice that ought not to be permitted. Here is a bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, accompanied by a committee report. A Senate bill is now proposed to be substituted for the House bill, and it is proposed to adopt the Senate bill, which the House committee itself has not recommended should pass, but instead has reported an entirely different bill. Now, I do not know but that this bill is meritorious throughout, but when we go through bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and come to the bill H. R. 22, see it bristling full of objections, we do not take the time to go into all the details of the bill. Some parts may be meritorious, but we can not examine them in detail, and for that reason we do not pay careful consideration to all of the details of the bill when as a whole it is objectionable.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. My recollection was—and I will ask the gentleman [Mr. STEPHENS of Texas] in charge of the bill whether it is not a fact—that the committee did really authorize the reporting of the Senate bill in lieu of the House bill. Did not the Committee on Indian Affairs do that? That is my recollection.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. The original bill, H. R. 22, was reported by the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Here is a bill of 12 pages, and only one-half of one page is devoted to this question.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. That bill has been voted down. The bill now before the House is a Senate bill.

Mr. GARNER: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT: Yes.

Mr. GARNER: The Committee on Indian Affairs is in favor of amending the present law so as to permit the adjudication of cases of nonjoinder and amity and alienage that failed to pass the House. The House refused to pass such cases. When the bill went to the Senate committee they amended the Senate bill so as to include all three of those characters of cases.

Now, then, knowing that this bill can not become a law, knowing that the judgment of the Committee on Indian Affairs can not be carried into effect, we tried to arrive at a compromise with those gentlemen who were opposing this character of legislation so as to get that portion of it that was unobjectionable. This is the only method we have to amend this bill now, and the sending of it back to the Senate will possibly or probably defeat the entire legislation, so that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] conceived the idea that the most practical and expedient way would be to substitute the Senate bill for this bill and pass the Senate bill.

Mr. LENROOT: The gentleman does not get my point. No Member of the House could have any notice of what matter was coming up under a practice of this kind. This is my objection.

Mr. MANN: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT: Yes.

Mr. MANN: Well, it seems to me that anyone would have full notice of what was coming up, although I may be mistaken. The House bill that was reported and the committee amendment to the Senate bill as reported provided that the alienage of the claimant or the want of amity in defendant Indians should not be considered as a bar against the claimant. That matter has been before the House repeatedly. I have quite a bunch of bills and reports thereon that have been before the House in previous Congresses. To those who have watched the matter it was very plain what they cover. That whole question is involved in the proposition.

Now, the committee are willing to say that they will throw out the want of amity as a lack of defense and leave that as a defense. Involved in most of the claims is the question of whether the Indians were in amity with the United States or not. Only the question of alienage is left. Now that whole matter is presented in both the House bill that was reported and in the committee amendment to the Senate bill that was reported, so that the whole matter is before anyone who has given any attention to it, and that, I think, is fair notice to every Member of the House.

The gentleman from Wisconsin would not claim that if the House has before it a bill that covers three matters it would not be in order as a matter of unanimous consent to pass a bill covering only one of the three?

Mr. LENROOT: No; but the gentleman certainly must see that with respect to a bill upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, involving a great many propositions, no Member is under any assumption that if there is one item in the bill that may be meritorious that is the one that is going to be considered and all the rest thrown away. He makes his objection to the bill as a whole, and when he sees several objectionable features to a bill he very naturally does not go to the minutiae of whether one particular item in the bill may be meritorious or not.

Mr. MANN: I should think he would, especially a careful man like my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT: The gentleman from Wisconsin does not.

Mr. MANN: I know I do. I think now that the gentleman from Wisconsin has never taken any interest in this bill in the past.

Mr. LENROOT: I am frank to say that I have not much information about it.

Mr. MANN: The gentleman has probably never given it particular attention. Those who have given it particular attention in opposition to the claim think that the Government really, by the passage of this bill, wins a great victory. I made a very exhaustive study of this matter some years ago and fought the claim when the bill was reported, and I have some of my memoranda here now. No one else was in opposition to the bill, except the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson], but we beat the bill in the House in the discussion of it.

Mr. LENROOT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], who I know has given a great deal of attention to this question, and confident as I am that the bill as proposed is meritorious, I will not object; but I do want to serve notice now that I believe the practice that has been indulged in with reference to this bill is a bad practice, and in the future I shall object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. I move to amend, on page 2, line 7, by striking out the word "claimant" and inserting the word "claim."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 7, strike out the word "claimant" and insert the word "claim."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. STEPHENS of Texas, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that House bill 22 be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that House bill 22 be laid on the table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BELL OF THE LATE U. S. S. "PRINCETON."

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to loan the bell of the late U. S. S. *Princeton* to the borough of Princeton, N. J.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to loan to the borough of Princeton, N. J., the bell of the old U. S. S. *Princeton*, which the Navy Department loaned the borough of Princeton for use in the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the borough.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, why and on what conditions is it proposed to do this?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit me, I have no knowledge of this bill, except that I see it is unanimously reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs, and that the report is drawn by the chairman of that committee [Mr. PADGETT]. I know that there was a lamentable explosion on the *Princeton* about the year 1843, killing a great many prominent people, among them, I think, the Secretary of the Navy. I suppose the bell of that vessel would not be used on any other ship after that.

Mr. MANN. When is the one hundredth anniversary of the incorporation of the borough of Princeton?

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. That was some time ago. The bell was loaned to the borough of Princeton at that time, and it is now proposed apparently to make a perpetual loan of this bell, which is obviously not a very large article. I will ask the Clerk to read the report.

Mr. MANN. You need not have the report read on my account. Unless somebody makes an explanation, I shall object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MANN. In the absence of anybody to look after the bill—

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Then, I will ask that it be laid over.

Mr. MANN. If they wanted to give this bell outright to the borough of Princeton, I do not know that I would object. I am not in favor of loaning it without knowing anything about the conditions on which it is proposed to be loaned.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us give it to them.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. Offer an amendment to give it to them.

Mr. MANN. No; I will not do that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will offer it, if the gentleman will not object.

Mr. MANN. I will not object, if you will ask unanimous consent.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to change the word "loan" to "donate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to strike out, in line 4, the word "loan" and to insert in lieu thereof the word "donate." Is there objection?

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, will it not be necessary, then, to say "without expense to the Government of the United States"?

Mr. MANN. I think that would be proper.

Mr. BORLAND. If those words are put in, I shall not object.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no expense to the Government. You do not need to do that.

Mr. BORLAND. It is better to add those words.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]?

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. I do not think this amendment ought to be agreed to without the concurrence of the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. They will have no objection to it. They want to give this bill to the borough of Princeton.

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia. Does the gentleman represent the committee that reported the bill?

Mr. FOSTER. No; but I will take the responsibility of saying that it is satisfactory to them. It is just intended as a memento.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. I will ask my colleague if he does not think we ought to change the word "loaned," in line 6, to "presented"?

Mr. MANN. No; it was loaned at that time. That is merely descriptive.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, that is right.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will venture to suggest that the title of the joint resolution ought to be amended.

Mr. FOSTER. I ask unanimous consent to strike out the word "loan" in the title and to insert the word "donate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to strike out the word "loan" where it appears in the title and to insert the word "donate." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL ENGINEERING CONGRESS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 307, authorizing the President to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Engineering Congress to be held at San Francisco, Cal., September 20 to 25, inclusive, 1915.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to extend invitations to other nations to appoint delegates or representatives to the International Engineering Congress to be held at San Francisco, Cal., September 20 to 25, inclusive, 1915: *Provided*, That no appropriation shall be granted for the expenses of delegates or for other expenses incurred in connection with the said congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, this is to authorize the President to extend invitations to nations to appoint delegates to an international engineering congress. How many congresses which are international in character are to be held in San Francisco during the Panama Exposition?

Mr. KAHN. I have not the exact number on hand, but I understand that there will be 10 or 15 international congresses.

Mr. MANN. The officials of the Panama Exposition claim that there will be many more; but, of course, we expect some exaggeration about that. The officers of the exposition say that there is to be a congress every day.

Mr. KAHN. That is true, but they are not all international. Many are State congresses; some congresses embrace a number of States. I believe there is a congress of the League of Municipalities in the United States. The number of international congresses is rather limited. Now, the International Congress of Engineers, as I understand, is a fixed body and has periodical meetings in various parts of the world. This is possibly the first time the organization is to hold a convention in the United States.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, there are many international congresses. Is it expected to pass a separate resolution for each one, to have the President invite them, or can some come without having an invitation while others require an invitation? Would it not be better to give to the President the authority in one resolution to invite Governments to participate in any congress?

Mr. KAHN. As I understand it, these organizations, when they hold their meetings in foreign countries, extend invitations through the Governments of those foreign countries. Some correspondence that I have had with officers of the International Engineering Congress would indicate to me that it has been customary in the past to receive invitations from foreign Governments for the sending of delegates. I understand that Col. Goethals is now and has been for some years the president ex officio of this congress; that it has an international standing; and that even some of the belligerent Governments will send engineers, or, rather, give its engineers from the respective countries credentials as delegates to this congress.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, where a Government invites delegates to a congress it imposes certain obligations on the part of the Government extending the invitations. This resolution says that the Government is responsible for the invitation, but when the delegates get here the Government is not responsible for their being properly taken care of. I fear that the Panama Exposition may become bankrupt before it is over. Of course I hope that it will not.

Mr. KAHN. I want to say to my friend from Illinois that never in the history of California has that State undertaken anything that has been a failure. The exposition at San Francisco is the most beautiful that has ever been constructed on this mundane sphere, and I say that with a full knowledge of the magnificent exposition that was held at Chicago, and the splendid one that was held at St. Louis, and the other expositions that have been held in various parts of the world. The people of California are known the world over for their hospitality.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Does not the gentleman from Illinois think that this could in anyway add to the financial injury of the exposition because the engineers in the great countries in Europe are otherwise engaged and would not attend?

Mr. KAHN. We have positive information that the great countries will send delegates if the invitation is extended. I want to say that France, even when she is at war, has sent her architects to San Francisco to put up her building and install her exhibit.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the gentleman from California suggest some way that a poor man can get out and see the exposition?

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman from Illinois might be appointed as a delegate.

Mr. KAHN. I feel satisfied that there will be no difficulty in getting out there for those who want to go, and I know that everyone who does go will come back delighted and instructed.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say that my experience with California has been that it is one of the greatest States in the Union, and one of the most enterprising lot of people anywhere in the country. They are conducting simultaneously two great expositions in that State, and unless it was a great State they could not do that with the rivalry between them.

Mr. KAHN. There is no rivalry between the expositions; one is the complement of the other. They have a different scope, like the two that were held in Italy two years ago.

Mr. MANN. I do not think we ought to go into the business of having the Government invite delegates to every congress that chooses to meet. There is no information given in the report in this case, absolutely none at all. I do not see why the delegates can not come if the foreign countries appoint them, if San Francisco wants to pay the bill. They will probably have no difficulty in getting delegates to any congress. I can see no object in the Government starting in and inviting delegates to come from abroad and then not even knowing that they are here. Objection was made this morning to a similar resolution, not at San Francisco, but at another exposition in California.

Mr. KAHN. That was not at an exposition in California; it was at Riverside.

Mr. MANN. I did not know that you had cut Riverside out of California.

Mr. KAHN. We have not; but there is no exposition there; there is to be a display of oranges, but is not an exposition.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. FINLEY. Does not the gentleman think that in the case of engineers of the character, reputation, and fame of Col. Goethals, whose fame is not only national but international, it would not be anything derogatory to the Congress to pass a simple resolution, which would involve no obligation and cost the Government nothing, inviting the great engineers of other

countries who have also international reputations? It would be merely an act of politeness on the part of this great Government.

Mr. MANN. We do not even appoint delegates ourselves to attend this engineers' congress. Here is a proposition to have the Government invite foreign nations to do it, and when they come here there is nobody to meet them at the trains.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. But they come by boat.

Mr. MANN. How does the gentleman know they come by boat?

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. There is no other way.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The United States is not entirely surrounded by water. There will be a great many of them come from Canada; in fact, that is where the most of them would come from.

Mr. KAHN. As I understand it, there are organizations of engineers in every one of the States, and no doubt they will have committees to meet these gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that they will, without any invitation being extended by the General Government.

Mr. KAHN. I do not think the gentleman wants to put any obstacles in the way of having this done.

Mr. MANN. I do not want to put any obstacles in the way of this congress, but this is a mere fancy on the part of somebody connected with the engineering congress. The other international congresses get along without it.

Mr. KAHN. The information that I have is that it is customary in extending invitations to this particular congress to have the invitation issued by the Governments where the congresses are to be held.

Mr. MANN. We have extended an invitation to delegates from South America to attend congresses in the United States this year, and it was said that it would cost \$30,000 or \$40,000. I may be wrong about the amount. We appropriated the money, and now we have a supplemental estimate that it will cost in the neighborhood of \$80,000 more. That is the way it goes.

Mr. KAHN. This does not call for any appropriation.

Mr. MANN. I know that it does not, but if we receive people we must see that they are properly provided for in some way.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will recall that when the matter was up before, especially at the other end of the Capitol, there was some complaint that the foreign guests had not been properly treated at former expositions, and the city of San Francisco promptly requested that the State Department designate somebody who would act in a semiofficial character, to represent the State Department and the Government. There has never been a single complaint since that time that a single representative of a single foreign Government has received any but the most courteous and most kindly treatment at San Francisco, and they have all come away from there delighted with their visit and fulsome in their expressions of appreciation of the courteous and kind treatment that had been extended them.

Mr. MANN. I know our Government has appointed a few people, and has made the Panama Exposition pay for them, to dance attendance upon some of these people. We have a bunch of fellows on the pay roll in that way, and I think it is a disgrace to the country and to the Panama Exposition Co.

Mr. KAHN. There are not many on the exposition pay roll.

Mr. MANN. I do not know, but you are paying for them. We have not made any appropriation, and they are drawing their salaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the resolution will be stricken from the calendar.

CREATION OF COAST GUARD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2337) to create the coast guard by combining therein the existing Life-Saving Service and Revenue-Cutter Service.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MANN (interrupting the reading). I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects, and the bill will be stricken from the calendar.

SALE OF LANDS IN LYMAN COUNTY, S. DAK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 11318) authorizing the sale of lands in Lyman County, S. Dak.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell for cash, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, the unallotted, unreserved, and unentered lands in Lyman County, S. Dak., being lands formerly in the

part of the Sioux Indian Reservation which was restored to the public domain by the act of March 2, 1889.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 7, strike out the words "being lands."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to have some explanation of the bill and how it will affect the public domain.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this bill affects 10,640 acres of land in Lyman County, S. Dak.

Mr. FINLEY. To whom does it belong now?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Lyman County was a part of the area ceded by the Indians in 1889, and opened to settlement under the homestead laws. The land has been subject to entry under the homestead laws since 1889, and all of it has been entered and patented many years ago except 10,640 acres.

Mr. FINLEY. Under what authority of law?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Under the homestead law.

Mr. FINLEY. Then what is the necessity of coming here now?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. These lands are isolated. They are located in the hills, rough and rocky, and can not be disposed of under the homestead laws.

Mr. FINLEY. How could they be entered and patented under the law if that is so?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. These lands have not been entered and patented. They are a part of the public domain. Nobody will take them because of their character. They are not lands that are susceptible of making a living on, considering the number of acres that a person is restricted to who makes a homestead entry.

Mr. FINLEY. About what is the value of the lands per acre?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I presume these lands will sell anywhere from \$2 to \$3 or \$4 an acre. I want to say to the gentleman that in the bills that have passed Congress in the last 10 years disposing of surplus lands in Indian reservations we have provided that after so many years—in one instance four years and in others seven years—all of the lands that had not been filed upon should be sold at public sale to the highest bidder; and in a number of reservations that has been done, but there is no provision of law for disposing of these remnants.

Mr. FINLEY. Of Indian lands.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Of what were formerly Indian lands that were ceded to the Government, paid for by the Government, and which have been open to entry under the homestead laws and the provisions of the free-homestead law since May 17, 1900, and nobody has taken them or applied for them, and just so long as there is no legislation these tracts will remain public domain, doing nobody any good, and there is no way by which they can be acquired.

Mr. FINLEY. Then I incorrectly understood the gentleman when I took it that these lands had been patented under the laws of the United States.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Oh, not at all. The balance of the lands have been acquired. These are only the remnants.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, is not this true, that these lands were set off to the Indians and since that time the county line has been changed?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not at all; and the Indians have no interest, directly or otherwise, in them.

Mr. FINLEY. And the money will go into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The money will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. FINLEY. Now, what is the proposition, to sell them as a whole?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Not at all; under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior; and I will say to the gentleman they are small tracts of 40 acres and in some instances of a few hundred acres, possibly not to exceed a section or two in any one place, perhaps not as much as that.

Mr. FINLEY. There is no limit to the price that the Secretary may fix?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. No limit whatever.

Mr. FINLEY. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this land has been subject to homestead entry at 50 cents an acre for a number of years, as I understand.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me correct the gentleman. That is the price paid in commutations, but if the settler lived upon the land for five years he could acquire title without pay-

ing the 50 cents since May, 1900, when the free-homes act was passed.

Mr. MANN. All I know about it is in the report, which says:

And lands which have not been disposed of within five years from the taking effect of the act were disposed of at 50 cents per acre, entry-men being required to comply with the homestead laws.

So my statement is correct if the statement of the First Assistant Secretary of the Interior Department is correct. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I will call the gentleman's attention to the same report from which he has just read, on page 2, to the words where it says:

The act of May 13, 1900, relieves the settler of the payment of said price.

Mr. MANN. Then it has been subject to homestead entry without any price?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Since 1900.

Mr. MANN. Having been for many years subject to be taken at 50 cents an acre, they could not find anybody to take it and then proposed to give title and could not find anybody to take it up. Now, what is it worth? I understood the gentleman to say some of it is worth \$3 or \$4 an acre. This might all be sold to one man under the terms of this bill for 10 cents an acre.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman accept a little practical information about how these remnants of land work out?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is what I want to state to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. I was raised in a public-land country, and I know how it works out.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman will recall the opening of Gregory County, a part of the Rosebud Reservation, which was the first bill since we adopted the new policy of disposing of surplus land in Indian reservations.

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That bill, I will say to the gentleman, provided that after four years all lands remaining undisposed of should be sold—the same as this bill—and the lands that were not taken by homesteaders were sold for an average price of about \$4.87 an acre.

Mr. MANN. Those were little odd pieces of land—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is what these are.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether these are or not, and the gentleman says they will not be taken under homestead entry. That is not the situation here, as I understand it at all—I may be incorrect, but these are little odd lands where a man who had a homestead bought it.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Many were bought by speculators.

Mr. MANN. Now, these lands the gentleman said are very bad—rough and rocky—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. That is true.

Mr. MANN. And you can not homestead. If that is the case there is no homestead right next to them. I think there ought to be some knowledge about the value of these lands and some restrictions about some one buying all of them.

Mr. FERRIS. On that point I want to suggest to the gentleman—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Let me say this to the gentleman: The reason why this bill is thrown open as it is is that the Secretary of the Interior may have full discretion to dispose of the land under such terms as he thinks are practical and to avoid future legislation. There is not enough land involved here to make it necessary to legislate again, and that is the theory of legislating as we did in bills that have passed heretofore with reference to disposing of the lands that would not be taken under the homestead law; and, as I have stated, it has worked satisfactorily, and all the remnants and isolated tracts have been sold at prices averaging \$4 to \$5 an acre, and they could not be disposed of under the homestead laws even though the price was only \$2.50 an acre. Nobody would take them under the homestead laws at any price.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. FERRIS. On several occasions since I have lived in the new State of Oklahoma we have had occurrences similar to this where Indian lands were sold and the proceeds put in the Treasury, and the Government went ahead and opened the lands and the lands dwindled down to only a few fragments—in this instance there are only 10,000 acres—and to leave these remnants hanging there is just an invitation for surrounding communities and towns to take advantage of and to fight and squabble over.

Now, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE] has come in with a bill here that is perfectly fair and square, and

it authorizes the sale of these remnant lands under rules and regulations to be proposed by the department. What the department will do will be to send out some competent man and have the lands appraised, and put them up and sell them on competitive bids. But the lands nearly always bring more than they are worth, and I have seen lands sold through the department under the competitive plan that two or three years later, with many improvements on them, sold for less than they brought at the sale. I think the gentleman from South Dakota has adopted the right method to get rid of this scrap land and get the money into the Treasury and not leave it for the citizens to fight for. I can see no earthly objection to the bill. I think it is a matter that ought to be cleaned up. I think this is the correct way to do it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. BURKE of South Dakota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MONEYS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN OKLAHOMA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill H. R. 16738, to provide for the payment of certain moneys to school districts in Oklahoma.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all moneys heretofore paid for lands sold by the Government for town-site purposes at the price of \$10 per acre under section 22 of the act entitled "An act to provide a temporary government for the Territory of Oklahoma, to enlarge the jurisdiction of the United States court in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes," approved May 2, 1890, and under the act entitled "An act providing for the commutation for town-site purposes of homestead entries in certain portions of Oklahoma," approved March 11, 1902, which have not already been paid to the proper municipal authorities shall be paid to the proper authorities of the several school districts in which the lands for which such moneys were paid are located; and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to cause such payments to be made out of the funds arising from such sales.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, upon what theory is the Government under any obligation to pay this money over?

Mr. FERRIS. The law provided for the opening of town sites, and that the money should be paid to the school districts as fast as it was collected. It was under the act of March 11, 1902, and under the act of May 2, 1890, two different kinds of town sites. The proceeds from all but 12 of them have been turned over to the school districts that were entitled to them. This treats the remaining 12 as the others were treated. This is a department bill. The report is short, and I know the gentleman is familiar with it. I think it gives all the information that I have.

Mr. MANN. I have read the department report.

Mr. FERRIS. I was satisfied the gentleman had done so.

Mr. MANN. We had provided that lands for town sites should be reserved, and provided that the money derived from the sale of those should be paid to the municipalities for school purposes, as I recall it—

Mr. FERRIS. That is true.

Mr. MANN. Now, we find that some of those reservations are not required for town sites at all, and they have been taken up for other purposes. Is not that the case?

Mr. FERRIS. That is about it.

Mr. MANN. And you now propose to pay that money to the school authorities?

Mr. FERRIS. As the gentleman knows, town sites are opened up throughout the new country here and there irrespective of railway facilities. Along came the railroad, and the railroad established railroad town sites near by, and everybody pulled up stakes from the Government town site and set up shop on the railroad town site, and there are oftentimes towns within that township, the same settlers and the same occupants, and they build quite a successful little town in the same community. For instance, in the little town of Pruitt, in my own community, plots, lots, and so forth, were filed for a Government town, and they went through the regular procedure, and along came

the Frisco Railroad and missed that town by a mile. The town-site people would not do anything with the Government town site, and they opened the little town of Cache near by. That town is right in the middle of Indian allotments, which are just as thick as hair up and down the creek. And the town and township need this money now just as badly with Cache as the town site as they would had the town of Pruitt survived. There are 12 instances of that kind.

Mr. MANN. Will they get the money? The original town site was in one place.

Mr. FERRIS. Yes. I think it will be all right. The department thinks so.

Mr. MANN. And the land sold was to go to schools in that town?

Mr. FERRIS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Now they locate a town somewhere else, and it seems they are not in the same school district. It is proposed to pay the money realized from the sale of that land to the school district in which the land is located, although the town might not be in that school district.

Mr. FERRIS. The department drew this bill, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. That does not prove it was well drawn.

Mr. FERRIS. It says:

To pay the proper authorities of the several school districts in which the lands for which such moneys were paid are located; and the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to cause such payments to be made out of the funds arising from such sales.

If the gentleman has any amendment which he thinks would make it accomplish more fully what we want to accomplish, I would be glad if he would offer it. It seems to me, however, that the language offered is sufficient. It reads:

Which have not already been paid to the proper municipal authorities shall be paid to the proper authorities in the several school districts in which the lands for which said moneys were paid are located.

This makes them pay it to the proper authorities of the school districts in that particular town or township.

Mr. MANN. Well, it may be all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. FERRIS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS OF PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 1281) providing for the retirement of certain officers of the Philippine Scouts.

The title of the bill was read.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next one.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE ST. LOUIS RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17762) to amend an act approved February 20, 1908, entitled "An act to authorize the Interstate Transfer Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota."

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] if he wants to ask that the bill be passed over?

Mr. LENROOT. If the gentleman desires to ask that it be passed over I am willing.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to the consideration of the bill. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that the bill 17762 and the bill 15727, the succeeding bill on the calendar, be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MILLER] asks unanimous consent that the House bill 15727 be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Both of them.

Mr. MILLER. H. R. 17762 and H. R. 15727.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And also the bill H. R. 17762. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next one.

COMMISSION TO SURVEY CRATER BATTLE FIELD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill [H. R. 13923] authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to appoint a commission to designate, define, and survey the battle field of the Crater at Petersburg, Va., and to collect certain data concerning the same and make report thereupon.

The bill was read, with a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WATSON. I was going to ask, Mr. Speaker, that the consideration of this bill go over to-day. It can be taken up at some other time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WATSON] asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MAJ. CLYDE S. FORD.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill [H. R. 15418] authorizing Maj. Clyde S. Ford, Medical Corps, to accept and wear the decoration tendered him by the Ottoman and Bulgarian Governments for services rendered in the Balkan wars.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to authorize an Army officer to accept a decoration. There are a great many of these decorations which have been tendered to Army and Navy officers and other officers of the Government that are up here in the State Department. Since I have been a Member of Congress I think no one has been authorized to accept one. I am not opposing allowing officers to accept decorations where it is proper. It may be proper in this case. But I am opposed, after refusing for years some of our best officers the privilege of accepting them, to singling out one man now and saying he may accept one.

I recently introduced a resolution reading as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the House of Representatives a list of decorations, medals, and other presents tendered to the officers of the United States, now held in the State Department.

That would be information that would tell us what there is up there. That resolution has been pending quietly in a pigeon-hole in the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which reported this bill, since October 7 last, and until I can get the information or at least have the resolution considered, I shall object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

CLAIMS OF THE UNITED STATES AGAINST THE STATE OF TENNESSEE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (S. J. Res. 65) to amend Senate joint resolution 34, approved May 12, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States."

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution to amend Senate joint resolution 34, approved May 12, 1898, entitled "Joint resolution providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States against the State of Tennessee and certain claims against the United States."

Whereas the resolution in the caption mentioned, being Senate joint resolution 34, approved May 12, 1898, providing for the adjustment of certain claims of the United States and of the State of Tennessee, provides that the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War of the United States, as representatives of the United States, and agents or commissioners to be appointed by the State of Tennessee, as representatives of the State, shall proceed by conference to compromise, adjust, and settle the claims in the resolution mentioned, but that the compromise or settlement shall not be effective as final until approved by Congress; and

Whereas at conference held between said representatives they have been unable to proceed because the said representatives of the United States have insisted that the settlement or compromise of the claims of the State of Tennessee under said Senate joint resolution 34 should be precluded by the consideration that the State of Tennessee was during the Civil War, in the resolution mentioned, a public enemy and in rebellion, and not entitled to compensation for any losses suffered by reason of the action of the United States in suppressing such rebellion; and

Whereas it was the true intent and purpose of said resolution to provide for the compromise, adjustment, and settlement of all the matters in the resolution mentioned, upon terms that would do equal and exact justice to the parties, on the merits of their claims; and

Whereas it is not deemed just that the consideration of the claims of Tennessee should, or can be, precluded, or the same disallowed upon the ground that the State was a public enemy and in rebellion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the said Senate joint resolution 34 be, and is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following, namely:

The claims of the parties respectively shall be considered, adjusted, and settled on their merits without regard to any question of loyalty or disloyalty, and upon such terms as to amounts and allowance of interest as shall do equal and impartial justice to the parties. The said compromise or settlement is not to be effective or final until approved by Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, a good many years ago a commission was appointed, consisting of the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War, to adjust the matter of claims between the United States and the State of Tennessee. One resolution was passed a few years ago giving them additional power. It is proposed now to pass this resolution, which destroys the defense of the Government as to loyalty on the part of Tennessee.

When this matter was passed through the Senate I asked the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCOTT] to go to the Attorney General's office and obtain information in regard to it. There was no information available; not very much, at least in the debates on the passage of the resolution in the Senate, and although a report has been made to the House there is not very much information in the report of the committee to the House. The gentleman from Iowa went to the Attorney General's office, and, if I remember aright, the Attorney General then was from the State of Tennessee, and that office declined to give the gentleman from Iowa any information. Until we can obtain information concerning it from the Attorney General's office I am not willing to pass, by unanimous consent, a resolution which relinquishes practically all the claim that the Government of the United States has against the State of Tennessee.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MANN. I am aware that the gentlemen representing the State of Tennessee are not to be held responsible for this failure on the part of the Attorney General; and yet where else are we to get the information? This is a very complicated matter. It is in the papers in the hands of the Attorney General, and although a resolution was pending affecting the matter in Congress, he declined to permit these papers to be examined in his office.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any reason that could exist that would prevent the Attorney General from giving such information, in response to the gentleman's request, as he asked for, but I am very much of the opinion that the Attorney General was not supplied with the information that was sought.

This controversy is of such a character that I do not think the facts in the matter appear in the Department of Justice. I can not understand why they should be there. It is a controversy growing out of some claims between the State of Tennessee and the United States that have not been adjudicated or adjusted. There has been no proceeding that I can think of that would cause the facts in this case to be in the Department of Justice. Now, this is an old claim which has been on hand a long time which the Government has against the State of Tennessee for some bonds and other indebtedness, but as against which the State of Tennessee claims an offset.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Since 1868 the Attorney General has been on a commission to settle these claims. Do I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to say that he thinks that although this commission has been in existence since 1868 it has no information on the subject?

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I think that the commission, consisting of two different Attorneys General before the one of whom the gentleman made his inquiry and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Treasury, never reached the point where they could ascertain the facts in this controversy, because they concluded that inasmuch as the offset claimed by the State of Tennessee arose out of matters that occurred chiefly during the war they were confronted with the question of the disloyalty of the State of Tennessee; and because of the State being disloyal they concluded that there was no occasion to go into the merits of the controversy or to ascertain what the real facts were. They stopped right on the threshold of the investigation, and never ascertained the facts or merits of the controversy. All this resolution seeks to do—

Mr. MANN. This resolution seeks to relinquish entirely the rights of the United States.

Mr. HOUSTON. No; I do not think that is a fair conclusion. All the resolution does—

Mr. MANN. Why certainly; that is what it is for.

Mr. HOUSTON. It only provides that these commissioners shall meet three commissioners appointed on the part of the State of Tennessee, and that they shall examine the equities of the parties in these claims and counterclaims; that they shall see what the real differences and what the equities of the parties are, and it proposes that that shall be done without regard to the question of loyalty or disloyalty. It further provides that the action of this commission shall not be final, but that it shall be reserved for Congress to pass upon this question. Now, this matter was up before the Senate and passed the Senate unanimously.

Mr. MANN. Without any information being presented to the Senate.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think there was a statement made to the Senate by the Senator from Tennessee that fully answered the demands of the occasion. Several Senators made inquiries, investigated it, and they were satisfied—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands that I do not desire to reflect upon the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HOUSTON. Certainly not.

Mr. MANN. But here is a case where there is a controversy, and it all hinges upon whether the Government had the right to deed some railroad property which belonged to a State that had voted to secede. That is the question in controversy. Now you propose to say that in considering the claim they shall not consider the question that Tennessee had seceded, and all the rights that our Government acquired by taking the property on the ground of secession fall to the ground, and we are rendered responsible. That is a settlement of the case in advance, so far as I can learn from the facts. I do not pretend to have the facts very fully. They are not set out in the report. The Attorney General, who I understand does have the information, did not decline on the ground that he did not have the information, but just declined because he thought it was too much trouble to let a Member of the House obtain information.

Mr. HOUSTON. The Attorney General can not have this information. The information that is sought in this matter is the very subject of this inquiry.

Mr. MANN. Then we ought to get the information before we pass the resolution.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman speaks of the State of Tennessee being in rebellion or revolt against the Government, and says that the Government is asked to relinquish all the claims that it may have. Now, a part of the matter involved in this controversy grew out of the operation of this railroad by the Federal Government for months after the war had ended. There can be no question of loyalty or disloyalty involved in that. That is one feature of the controversy that they could report on, and on which they could get the information.

Mr. MANN. Why do they not do it?

Mr. HOUSTON. Because this commission never acted at all. They said at the outset that they were not prepared to go through the whole matter, and they have made no report on it.

Mr. MANN. But they have the authority to act. Why have they not acted?

Mr. HOUSTON. Because they did not see proper to make two bites of a cherry. I suppose they wanted to do it all at once when it was done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. I object.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I think if all the facts were understood, there would be no objection to the passage of this resolution. If this involved the question of Congress surrendering any defenses the Government may have against the claim presented by the State of Tennessee, I myself, having at heart the interests of the Government as well as those of my own State, would not support the resolution; but on its face this resolution expressly reserves to the Government the defense to which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] refers. It is left entirely to Congress to say in the end whether any report made by this commission shall be ratified. If the commission suggests a settlement of the claims and equities of the respective parties, the claims of the State and the General Government, it is then left to Congress to say whether the question of the attempted secession of the State shall operate as a bar to the claims of the State or any part of them. Now, as I understand this situation, some of these claims have been pending since before the

war. Some of them accrued since the war. The State of Tennessee, upon the other hand, has had some alleged counterclaims. While there are conflicting views as to that, I have the impression that it may turn out that the claims of the Government exceed those of the State. But the main question in which I am interested is to see this controversy settled. If it develops that the Government has a larger amount of valid claims than the State, then the balance should be settled in favor of the Government. If, on the other hand, it should appear that none of the claims of the State are bona fide or legal and valid, then the matter will be developed through the report of this commission and laid before Congress, in order that the report may be ratified or rejected and the controversy forever settled.

Now, I think that since this matter was thoroughly discussed in the Senate committee and was discussed at some little length—two or three pages in the Record—in the Senate, and that it was agreed to by all the Members of the Senate, the House should pass the resolution to authorize this board to come together and agree upon a tentative conclusion with respect to these conflicting claims, and then that agreement would come back to Congress for its ratification or rejection and we could adjust the matter permanently. If the resolution should be defeated, if Congress should refuse to take such further steps as to enable the commission to perform its functions, then the Government and the State will be obliged to resort to the courts of the country in a number of different lawsuits and opposing lawsuits, and the matter would linger along, causing great trouble and expense.

Now, when this report comes in Congress could and would pass upon the question as to whether the attempted secession of Tennessee was, under the holdings of the Federal court, a bar; and if not, then they would act accordingly in passing on the validity of the claims of the State.

Mr. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I will.

Mr. NORTON. There is no reason why this commission appointed 16 years ago can not report at once.

Mr. HULL. If my colleague [Mr. Houston] did not make himself clear on that point, I want to say that, as I understand, whenever the commission acted heretofore they have become engaged in this discussion as to whether the attempted secession of Tennessee, through the vote of the general assembly, was such an act as operated as a bar to the claims of the State. The difference of opinion that arose upon that one question has prevented any further deliberation or investigation and consideration of the matter. Now, in order that these conflicting claims may be considered and the results put in a concrete form and brought to Congress, it is asked here in this resolution that that question may be premitted by the board and its conclusions upon other questions laid before Congress, and have Congress pass upon all of them, including the question of loyalty.

Mr. NORTON. This resolution before the committee now merely proposes to change the rules of law and equity as to the settlement of these claims.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon; the resolution does not undertake to change any rule or any law; it refers to the commission with all the rights of defense reserved to Congress, so that when the report comes in it will have no binding effect whatever until Congress shall act upon it.

Mr. NORTON. The commission now has the right to report a proper settlement under the rules of law and equity.

Mr. HULL. The original commission was authorized to determine the conflicting claims, but the question of the attempted secession of the State rose at each meeting of the commission, and they failed to act.

Now, in order that the matter may be settled, instead of directing the commission to make final and complete determination of the matter the resolution seeks to direct the commission to consider all the conflicting claims and make a report to Congress and allow Congress to pass on the defenses of both the State and the Government.

Mr. NORTON. If the resolution is passed and the commission reports the equities as between the State and the Federal Government, and Congress decides that there should be taken into consideration the disloyalty of Tennessee, and determines that the State was disloyal, will Congress have before it the facts to determine what the damages are or what the claims of the Federal Government should be as against the State? Is it not a fact that the real purpose of passing this resolution is to cut out for all time the question of disloyalty of the State and bring in a settlement for this Congress where Congress will not have the facts as to what the rights were between the parties and the State was found to be disloyal at the time the property was taken over?

Mr. HULL. On the contrary, this resolution expressly reserves to the Government that defense to which the gentleman refers. If this resolution passes, the commission would make its report in the alternative.

Mr. NORTON. On its face it purports to give Congress the right, but, when the matter is brought up before the Congress, Congress has no facts to act upon.

Mr. HULL. The report of the commission will be such that if Congress determines that the attempted secession of the State was a valid defense, then certain claims would be eliminated.

Mr. NORTON. The matter would have to be sent back to the commission again?

Mr. HULL. No; it would simply be eliminated so far as the action of Congress was concerned.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not profess to speak with much information, for I have not been able to secure it up to this date. As I understand this matter, the State of Tennessee seceded, and at that time owned a lot of railway bonds, I suppose, for money advanced in aid of the railroads. The United States in the course of the rebellion seized the railroads on the ground that the State of Tennessee was in rebellion and that they had the right to seize them and operate them. The Government seized the railroads, and did operate them, and the rolling stock was greatly depreciated. Afterwards the State of Tennessee practically—I do not know whether actually—came into ownership of the bonds and made a claim against the Government for depreciation of the rolling stock and damage to the roads.

It seems to me that the question of loyalty is inextricably interwoven in that proposition. Now, the resolution says that the commission shall pass upon the question without considering the question of loyalty. That is to admit the claim of Tennessee. That is what this resolution means and that is what it amounts to. So that we are prejudging the case by the passage of the resolution, as it seems to me. While the gentleman from Tennessee calls attention to the fact that these commissioners can not enter judgment, that it is to be referred to Congress for final adjudication—that is, for an appropriation—still from the moment that the commission makes a report we will be told that a commission composed of impartial officials of the Government have made a report finding that so much was due.

I read in the Washington Post of this city this morning an editorial in which it was said that the Court of Claims had entered great numbers of judgments against the Government which were not paid, criticizing the Government because it did not pay these claims which had been allowed. Not one of them is a judgment. We pay a judgment secured in the Court of Claims, as a matter of course, without controversy, without question. Those were findings of the Court of Claims, they were not judgments, yet the distinguished gentleman who wrote that editorial thought that they were judgments. When a commission reports, we will say, or the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Hull] will say, and everyone else, "Here is the report of a commission; we ought to pay whatever is found by the report of a commission." That is all right, if a man can act upon all of the facts in the case; but by this resolution you cut out any question of loyalty and you decide in advance that the Government had no right to seize this property and use these railroads without paying for the depreciation.

Mr. HULL. Is it the gentleman's contention that the Federal courts have not held that the attempted action of State legislatures to put the States in the attitude of secession was null and void?

Mr. MANN. That is not the question at all. The whole rebellion was null and void. All of the secession was null and void, but the facts are there just the same. They are theoretically null and void, but practically we were in a state of war between two countries.

Mr. HULL. I was just getting at the way this matter is developing. The administrations in power since the war have given sufficient importance to these claims of Tennessee that they have not undertaken to collect the claims of the Federal Government against that State without a mutual consideration and settlement of all the claims and counterclaims, and it has been upon the theory that the Federal courts have held as I have just indicated, and that is why I thought we ought to reach some method by which this entire controversy could be wound up and the Government rights secured, less whatever set-off the States might be able to show, provided Congress should hold as the courts have held on that question.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, theoretically, of course, the war determined that a State could not secede. That was not determined, however, until after the war was over. No one knew before the war was over whether a State could constitutionally secede or not. That was what we fought about. That was the

decision of the war. The courts followed that decision. Theoretically a State can not secede, but actually the State did secede. If, as a result of that, the Government seized something which it has a right to seize upon the theory of secession, I do not see any reason now for changing that policy; I do not undertake to pass upon that, but you determine it in advance without having the facts before us.

Mr. HULL. I beg the gentleman's pardon. It is not the purpose of this resolution to do that. It is intended to keep that in abeyance until the commission makes its report as to the merits of the claims and counterclaims. The Congress will then pass on the question as to whether that will be a valid defense.

Mr. MANN. My friend from Tennessee, Mr. HULL, or the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Houston, after the commission shall report, will come in and say, "We have a report of the commission composed of three officers of the Government, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, and the Attorney General, and certainly you can not go back of a report of these three officers of the Government," and they will insist on paying the claims, although the three officers of the Government find their hands bound before they commence work.

Mr. HULL. Congress could just as well pass on that question then as on any other phase of the report, could it not?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it could. It could pass upon it then. It can not pass upon it intelligently now, because we do not have the information before us.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I thought my colleague [Mr. Houston] would seek recognition. I ask unanimous consent, in view of the statements of the gentleman from Illinois in regard to the absence of certain information, that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER AT DECATUR, ALA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 17168) to authorize the North Alabama Traction Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Tennessee River at Decatur, Ala.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the North Alabama Traction Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Alabama, its successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and all approaches thereto across the Tennessee River at Decatur, Ala., at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906: *Provided,* That said bridge shall be constructed, maintained, and operated so that it may be used for steam and electric railroad purposes, and shall be provided with an adequate and separate roadway and approach for the continuous use by the public as a highway bridge, to be used by vehicles, pedestrians, horsemen, animals, and all kinds of highway traffic and travel, for the transit of which reasonable rates of toll may be charged and received, but no rate for passage of a single passenger on a railroad train shall exceed 25 cents.

SEC. 2. That the North Alabama Traction Co. may not be required to construct that portion of the approaches on either side of said bridge that are required to make the same ready for vehicles, pedestrians, and other highway traffic until there shall be paid to said company, or secured to its use by local authorities or interests, the sum of \$50,000, and said company shall not be required thereafter to maintain or bear any of the costs of maintaining such portions of said approaches, and shall not collect or receive tolls for use of said approaches.

SEC. 3. That the North Alabama Traction Co. shall have the right to sell, transfer, or lease to any county, city, or other municipality any part of such portions of said approaches or of the separate roadway provided for in this act, or both, and in the event of such sale, transfer, or lease the said North Alabama Traction Co. shall be relieved of any requirements to maintain the property so sold, transferred, or leased, and shall not thereafter charge or receive any tolls for use of said wagon way and approaches.

SEC. 4. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. If this bridge is transferred or leased to a county, city, or other municipality, who is to maintain it?

Mr. HARRIS. The parties who lease it.

Mr. MANN. There is nothing in the bill to that effect.

Mr. HARRIS. The people who lease it will have to maintain it, I think.

Mr. MANN. Supposing you provide for tolls upon this bridge, is the gentleman willing to make that read so that it shall be in accordance with the provisions of the general bridge act?

Mr. HARRIS. This bridge bill is drawn just like the bridge bill at Memphis, Tenn.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference. Is the gentleman willing to accept an amendment, on page 2, line 9, by inserting, after the word "received," the language "in accordance with the provisions of the aforementioned act," so that there will be no question that the Secretary of War has jurisdiction over the matter of tolls?

Mr. ADAMSON. I think the gentleman will notice that in the former part of the bill he will find that language.

Mr. MANN. Well, I do not find it.

Mr. HARRIS. It is in lines 9 and 10, first page.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; I understand that. But, then, the gentleman goes ahead and says the bridge shall be built in accordance with the general bridge act. That covers the question of tolls. Then farther down he says that the tolls shall be reasonable, but no rate for passage shall exceed 25 cents. That is entirely useless unless the purpose is to relieve it from the operations of the general bridge act. I want to be sure it is still under the operation of the general bridge act.

Mr. HARRIS. We have no objection to that.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will insert, before the word "receive," "in accordance with the provisions of the aforementioned act," that removes any objection about it.

Mr. HARRIS. We have no objection.

Mr. MANN. Then, on page 3, why should this company be relieved of any requirement to maintain the property so sold, transferred, or leased, and no one else be required to maintain it?

Mr. HARRIS. It is believed that if this company parts with it the parties purchasing it will maintain and operate it. They have to pay for it.

Mr. MANN. But the authority given in here is for this company to construct, maintain, and operate. Then you provide that the company may sell, transfer, or lease, and then you say that the company shall be relieved of the requirement of maintaining the property.

Mr. HARRIS. After it is sold.

Mr. MANN. Yes; but you do not give anybody else the authority to maintain it.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the gentleman will yield, I suggest that the bill provides that it may be leased, transferred, or sold to a city, county, or municipality.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand that the county or municipality would have the duty imposed upon it to maintain it as a public highway.

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether they would have the right to maintain it as a highway; that is what I am talking about. Here is a bill conferring the right on the North Alabama Traction Co. to maintain and operate this bridge. Then you say that upon its sale the company shall be no longer required to maintain it, and you do not give anybody else the right to maintain it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The bridge has to be constructed not only as a bridge for steam and electric railways but also as a combination bridge for a public highway.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but the gentleman does not get my point. We give authority to the company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across a navigable stream.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. We assume that without that authority they have no right to maintain and operate it even after they have constructed it. Now, you give authority to this company to construct, maintain, and operate this bridge. Then you say under certain conditions they shall no longer be required to maintain it, and you do not give the authority to maintain it to anybody else. I do not undertake to say whether the language "maintain and operate" in these bridge bills is necessary or whether it might not be assumed that when you give authority to construct that you thereby give authority to construct and operate, but we have always put it in these bills, and, if it is necessary, this bill would not give authority to anybody else to operate it.

Mr. ADAMSON. Does the gentleman from Illinois think it is better to confer authority on the transferee or strike out the exemption to the bridge company?

Mr. MANN. I think it is better to strike out the exemption to the bridge company; then that company has authority to maintain it, and passes it to the transferee.

Mr. ADAMSON. In their contract they can pass it on.

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMSON. I think that is right.

Mr. MANN. That leaves the company the right to maintain.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the gentleman offer that as an amendment?

Mr. ADAMSON. The committee will offer that amendment, if the gentleman will permit, and strike out the language exempting the company.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 2, by inserting, after the word "received," in line 9, the following: "In accordance with the provisions of the aforementioned act."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on page 1, the gentleman from Georgia desires to offer an amendment, in line 1, striking out all after the word "Company" down to and including the word "and," in line 3.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will the Clerk report the language proposed to be stricken out.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 3, by striking out, after the word "Company," in line 1, the following: "Shall be relieved from any requirements to maintain the property so sold, transferred, or leased and."

Mr. ADAMSON. Does that include all the language?

Mr. MANN. That would leave it so that it would read:

The said North Alabama Traction Co. shall not thereafter charge or receive any tolls for use of said wagon way and approaches.

Mr. ADAMSON. That is right, because the public has to furnish the money.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "at" and before the word "Decatur," insert the words "or near."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended so as to conform to the text.

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. BARKLEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDINGS ON ALLEYWAYS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the bill S. 1624, "An act to regulate the construction of buildings along alleyways in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," in on this calendar, being No. 339. A bill in exact language to that passed the House and Senate and became a law, and I ask that this bill not only be stricken from this calendar but from the Union Calendar, and that it lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the bill S. 1624, Calendar No. 339, be stricken from this calendar and also from the Union Calendar and be laid on the table. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MUNICIPAL BRIDGE, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up out of its regular order the bill H. R. 19424, a bill to extend the time for the completion of the municipal bridge in St. Louis, Mo.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of the bridge authorized by an act entitled "An act to authorize the city of St. Louis, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Missouri, to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River," approved June 25, 1906, be, and the same is hereby, extended for the period of three years from the date of the passage of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri to take the bill H. R. 19424 up out of its regular order and consider it now?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. IGOE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 412) to increase the limit of cost of the United States public building at Grand Junction, Colo.

The bill was read in full.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BORLAND. Reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from Colorado if this bill has ever been called on this calendar before?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No, sir; it has never been reached before.

Mr. BORLAND. Is this the first time it has been called on this calendar?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BORLAND. Then I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS TO MINORS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 18851) to prohibit the sale or gift of intoxicating liquors to minors within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 288 of the act approved March 4, 1909, entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," is hereby amended by adding thereto the following as a new section:

"SEC. 288a. Whoever shall sell, give, or dispense in any manner intoxicating liquors of any kind as a beverage to any person under the age of 21 years, within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$500 for each offense. The master of every vessel is directed to enforce this prohibition, and in case any violation of this act is permitted or is committed upon any vessel by any officer or employee of said vessel then said vessel shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$500, the amount of the fine to be determined by the Secretary of Commerce in the same manner that other fines for violation of the navigation and inspection laws are now determined under section 5294 of the Revised Statutes of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am in entire sympathy with this bill and the purposes of it. No one can criticize the prohibition of the gift or sale of intoxicating liquors to minors, but I assume this bill is going to be used as a vehicle for amendment so as to project the prohibition question before the House at this late hour of the day. If it is, I shall be compelled to object. If it is the intention to pass the bill as it stands, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I believe the gentleman was in the Chamber when I made that remark.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington rise?

Mr. BRYAN. I wish to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 11: After the words "United States" add the following: "or elsewhere within the jurisdiction of the United States and outside the jurisdiction of any particular State."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not germane.

The SPEAKER. Why is it not?

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill under consideration restricts this proposition to the consideration of those cases which are within the maritime and admiralty jurisdiction of the United States. It is for one specific purpose, limited to that particular condition. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] seeks to open it up and make it a general proposition. It is well within the rulings of the House that where a bill refers to one specific case it is not permissible by amendment to make it a general law. The amendment of the gentleman from Washington seeks to make this general in its character. Therefore I think I am well within my grounds in contending that it is not germane.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, the amendment does not broaden the subject matter of the bill in any respect. The amendment merely goes to the extent of the area that this enactment, if it be enacted into law, shall apply to, and makes it apply, for instance, to islands that are outside of the jurisdiction of any State. I think that it is perfectly in order while this thing is

before us, while we are considering whether or not we will make this law effective on the high seas, and on the Great Lakes, and on the rivers, and in the canals, and on the inland waterways, and the gulfs and bays, where our ships may go, for us to consider whether or not that other jurisdiction which is surrounded by this particular jurisdiction shall also be included. It is only a matter of area and not a matter of subject matter. It is certainly constitutional, a good amendment, and one that ought to be adopted.

The SPEAKER. It has been decided over and over again, so that it is not any more a controverted question, that where we are legislating on one particular class of subjects we can not spread them out to take in others. For instance, the important ruling along that line was to the effect that when we took one Territory into the Union we could not hitch on another to the same bill. Also when they had up the bill prohibiting the trading in cotton futures, since the present occupant of the chair has been Speaker, there was an amendment offered to it to take in wheat and corn and similar articles, of which I was very much in favor personally, but paying attention to the precedents the Chair had to rule it out. And the Chair rules this out.

The question is—

Mr. BRYAN. I have another amendment which I desire to offer, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 1, line 11: After the words "United States" add "or in the Philippine Islands."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that it is not germane.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BRYAN. I submit another amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the words "United States," add the following: "or elsewhere within the jurisdiction of the United States and outside the jurisdiction of any particular State."

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, that is the amendment that was read a moment ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that that is not germane.

The SPEAKER. Is not that the same amendment?

Mr. BRYAN. Yes. I had not sent the other up. The Clerk did not wait.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 11, after the words "United States," add "or in Alaska."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I make the same point of order on that.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. STAFFORD. Question, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BRYAN. I offer this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 1, after the word "exceeding," strike out "\$500" and insert "\$1,000," and add "or imprisonment for not more than one year, or both such fine and imprisonment."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I call for a division on that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 1, noes 15.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of the Bryan amendment to increase the penalty will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 13, nays 244, answered "present" 2, not voting 168, as follows:

YEAS—13.

Bell, Cal.
Brockson
Bryan
Carlin

Cramton
Crisp
Fowler
Gilmore

Keating
La Follette
Park
Quin

Sims

NAYS—244.

Adamson
Alexander
Ashbrook
Aswell

Bailey
Baker
Barkley
Barnhart

Bathrick
Beakes
Beall, Tex.
Blackmon

Booher
Borland
Brodbeck
Broussard

Brown, N. Y.
Brown, W. Va.
Browning
Buchanan, Ill.
Buchanan, Tex.
Bulkeley
Burgess
Burke, S. Dak.
Burnett
Butler
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrns, Tenn.
Calder
Campbell
Candler, Miss.
Cantrill
Caraway
Carter
Church
Cline
Collier
Connelly, Kans.
Conry
Cooper
Copley
Cox
Cresser
Cullop
Curry
Danforth
Decker
Deltrick
Dent
Dickinson
Dies
Difenderfer
Dillon
Donohoe
Donovan
Doollittle
Doremus
Doughton
Dupré
Eagle
Edmonds
Edwards
Esch
Fairchild
Fergusson
Ferris
Fess
Fields
FitzHenry
Flood, Va.
Foster
Francis
Fear

French
Gallagher
Gard
Gardner
Garner
Garrett, Tenn.
Gill
Gillett
Glass
Goodwin, Ark.
Gray
Green, Iowa
Greene, Vt.
Gudger
Hamilton, Mich.
Hamill
Hamlin
Hardy
Harris
Harrison
Hart
Haugen
Hawley
Hay
Hayden
Hayes
Heflin
Helgesen
Helm
Henry
Hensley
Hill
Hinds
Hinebaugh
Holland
Houston
Howard
Howell
Hoxworth
Hughes, Ga.
Hullings
Hull
Humphrey, Wash.
Humphreys, Miss.
Igoe
Jacoway
Johnson, Ky.
Johnson, S. C.
Johnson, Utah
Johnson, Wash.
Kahn
Kent
Kettner
Key, Ohio
Kindel
Kinkaid, Nebr.
Kirkpatrick

Konop
Korby
Lafferty
Langham
Lazaro
Lee, Pa.
Lenroot
Leshner
Lever
Levy
Linthicum
Lloyd
Lobeck
Lonergan
McAndrews
McGuire, Okla.
McLaughlin
Madden
Maguire, Nebr.
Mahan
Maher
Mann
Mapes
Martin
Metz
Miller
Mitchell
Mondell
Montague
Moon
Moore
Morgan, La.
Morgan, Okla.
Morrison
Moss, Ind.
Murray
Nelson
Nolan, J. I.
Norton
O'Brien
Oldfield
Padgett
Page, N. C.
Parker, N. J.
Peterson
Phelan
Platt
Plumley
Porter
Post
Pou
Pronty
Rainey
Raker
Rauch
Rayburn
Reilly, Conn.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2.

Falconer

Palmer

NOT VOTING—168.

Abercrombie
Adair
Alken
Ainey
Allen
Anderson
Ansberry
Anthony
Austin
Avis
Baltz
Barchfeld
Bartholdt
Bartlett
Barton
Bell, Ga.
Borchers
Bowdle
Britten
Browne, Wis.
Bruckner
Brumbaugh
Burke, Pa.
Burke, Wis.
Callaway
Cantor
Carew
Carr
Cary
Casey
Chandler, N. Y.
Clancy
Clark, Fla.
Claypool
Coady
Connolly, Iowa
Dale
Davenport
Davis
Dershem
Dixon
Dooling

Driscoll
Drukker
Dunn
Eagan
Elder
Estopinal
Evans
Falson
Farr
Finley
Fitzgerald
Floyd, Ark.
Fordney
Gallivan
Garrett, Tex.
George
Gerry
Gittins
Godwin, N. C.
Goeke
Goldfogle
Good
Gordon
Gorman
Goulden
Graham, Ill.
Graham, Pa.
Greene, Mass.
Gregg
Griffith
Guernsey
Hamilton, N. Y.
Hammond
Helvering
Hobson
Hughes, W. Va.
Jones
Kelster
Kelley, Mich.
Kelly, Pa.
Kennedy, Conn.

Reilly, Wis.
Rogers
Rouse
Rube
Rucker
Russell
Scott
Seldomridge
Shackelford
Sherley
Sinnott
Sisson
Slomp
Sloan
Small
Smith, Idaho
Smith, J. M. C.
Smith, N. Y.
Smith, Tex.
Stafford
Stanley
Stedman
Steenserson
Stephens, Cal.
Stephens, Nebr.
Stevens, Minn.
Stone
Stout
Stringer
Sutherland
Switzer
Talcott, N. Y.
Tavener
Taylor, Ala.
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Colo.
Temple
Ten Eyck
Thacher
Thomas
Thomson, Ill.
Treadway
Tribble
Underhill
Underwood
Vaughan
Vinson
Vollmer
Volstead
Watkins
Watson
Webb
Williams
Willis
Wingo
Winslow
Young, Tex.

Riordan
Roberts, Mass.
Roberts, Nev.
Rothermel
Rupley
Sabath
Saunders
Scully
Sells
Sherwood
Shreve
Slayden
Smith, Md.
Smith, Minn.
Smith, Saml. W.
Sparkman
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Tex.
Summers
Taggart
Talbot, Md.
Taylor, N. Y.
Thompson, Okla.
Towne
Townsend
Tuttle
Vare
Walker
Wallin
Walsh
Walters
Weaver
Whaley
Whitacre
White
Wilson, Fla.
Wilson, N. Y.
Witherspoon
Woodruff
Woods
Young, N. Dak.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

For the session:

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

Until further notice:

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. WALLIN.

Mr. ALLEN with Mr. BARTON.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. PARKER.
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.
 Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. AINEY.
 Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. ANDERSON.
 Mr. ADAIR with Mr. BARCHFELD.
 Mr. AIKEN with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
 Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. AUSTIN.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. AVIS.
 Mr. CASEY with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. BRITTON.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin.
 Mr. DALE with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. FARR.
 Mr. DERSHEM with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. DIXON with Mr. FORDNEY.
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. GOOD.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. DRUKKER.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. DUNN.
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
 Mr. GORDON with Mr. KEISTER.
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. J. R. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. LEWIS of Maryland with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. LIEB with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. MCGILLICUDDY with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. MCKELLAR with Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. NEELY of West Virginia with Mr. MOSS of West Virginia.
 Mr. NEELEY of Kansas with Mr. LINDQUIST.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. MORIN.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. PAIGE of Massachusetts.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SARATH with Mr. POWERS.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. TOWNER.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Texas with Mr. WOODS.
 Mr. SUMNERS with Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.
 Mr. TAGGART with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. WHALEY with Mr. SHREVE.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. There is a quorum here.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] moves the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage. Those in favor of the motion will say "aye."

The affirmative vote was taken.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. I desire to offer an amendment. Under this condition can I not offer another amendment?

The SPEAKER. It is too late.

Mr. BRYAN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The roll call just this moment shows that there is a quorum present.

Mr. BRYAN. The period for the amendment of the bill had not been passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but any gentleman has the right to move the previous question on a bill at any stage of the proceedings. Of course, as a matter of practice and courtesy, the Chair generally recognizes the man in control of the bill.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes to explain that amendment and state why I offered it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I object, Mr. Speaker.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered, and the Chair lays before the House the following report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills:

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:
 H. R. 13698. An act for the relief of Charles A. Coulson.

SALE OF INTOXICATING LIQUOR TO MINORS.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BRYAN. The negative has not been put to the House on that question. I made the inquiry before the Chair put it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's recollection is that both sides were put. However, the Chair will put it again. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will say "aye;" those opposed will say "no."

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes have it.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It has been only three minutes since the roll call developed 257 gentlemen present.

Mr. BRYAN. I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. BRYAN] asks for a division. Those in favor of ordering the previous question will rise and stand until they are counted.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 181, noes 3.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, this demonstrates the want of a quorum, but I will not insist on the point.

Mr. HOWARD. The gentleman will note that 35 or 40 men did not vote.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The question being taken, the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BRYAN. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting]. Two hundred and twenty-one Members present—a quorum.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, before you make that announcement I want to ask unanimous consent that my name may be recorded as against this bill, and I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. There is a quorum here anyhow.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman may vote in favor of selling liquor to minors if he wants to.

Mr. BRYAN. But I will not be doing any such thing.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent—I believe it is my privilege—to extend in the RECORD my remarks in explanation of my opposition to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill just passed. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I assume that the gentleman wishes to extend his remarks in the back part of the RECORD and not in the body of the proceedings.

Mr. BRYAN. I agree to that.

The SPEAKER. That is where the remarks ought to be extended, whether the gentleman wants it so or not. That is the rule and practice of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MORIN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. AUSTIN, for one week, on account of sickness.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. GREEN of Iowa, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of H. R. 22976, no adverse report having been made thereon.

THE LATE SENATOR JOHNSTON AND THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE RICHARDSON.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the order which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 693.

Resolved, That Sunday, January 31, 1915, be set apart for services upon the life, character, and public services of Hon. JOSEPH F. JOHNSTON, late a Senator from the State of Alabama, and of the Hon. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, late a Representative from the State of Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

UNIFORM GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 17971) for securing the uniform grading of grain, preventing deception in transactions in grain, and regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act shall be known by the short title of the "grain grades act."

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to investigate the handling, grading, and transportation of grain and to fix and establish as soon as may be after the enactment hereof standards of quality and condition for corn (maize), wheat, rye, oats, barley, flaxseed, and such other grains as in his judgment the usages of trade may warrant and permit. In promulgating the standards the Secretary shall specify the date or dates when the same are to become effective, and shall give public notice, not less than 60 days in advance of such date or dates, by such means as he deems proper.

SEC. 3. That the standards so fixed and established shall be known as the official grain standards of the United States.

SEC. 4. That whenever standards shall have been fixed and established under this act for any grain no person thereafter shall ship or deliver for shipment from any State, Territory, or District or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country, any such grain which is sold or offered for sale by grade unless the grade by which it is sold or offered for sale be one of the grades fixed therefor in the official grain standards of the United States, and the grain shall have been inspected and graded by an inspector licensed under this act, and the grain conforms to the standard fixed and established for the specified grade: *Provided*, That any such grain not sold or offered for sale by grade may be sold, offered for sale, shipped, or delivered for shipment by sample or by type, or under any name, description, or designation which is not false or misleading, and which name, description, or designation does not include in whole or in part the terms of any official grain standard of the United States: *Provided further*, That any such grain sold or offered for sale by one of the grades fixed therefor in the official grain standards may be shipped from any place at which no inspector licensed under this act is located to or through any place at which such an inspector is located, subject, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe, to be inspected at the place to which shipped, or at the place through which shipped for inspection, and subject further to the right of appeal from such inspection, as provided in section 6 of this act: *And provided further*, That any such grain sold or offered for sale by any of the grades fixed therefor in the official grain standards may, upon compliance with the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, be shipped from a place at which there is no inspector licensed under this act to a place at which there is no such inspector, subject to the right to refer any dispute as to the grade of the grain to the Secretary of Agriculture, who may determine and certify the true grade thereof: *And provided further*, That variations from the official grain standards may be permitted under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe. No person shall in any certificate or in any contract or agreement of sale or agreement to sell by grade, either oral or written, involving, or in any invoice or bill of lading or other shipping document relating to the shipment or delivery for shipment, in interstate or foreign commerce, of any grain for which standards shall have been fixed and established under this act describe, or in any way refer to, any of such grain as being of any grade other than a grade fixed therefor in the official grain standards of the United States.

SEC. 5. That no person shall certify or otherwise represent that any grain which has been shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce is of a grade fixed in the official grain standards unless the same conforms to the standard fixed therein for that grade or is within the variations from that grade permitted by the rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture under section 4 of this act; and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause examinations to be made of any grain for which standards shall have been fixed and established under this act, and which has been certified to conform to any grade fixed therefor in such official grain standards, or which has been shipped or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce. Whenever, after opportunity for hearing is given to the owner or shipper of the grain involved, and to the inspector thereof if the same has been inspected, it is determined by the Secretary that any quantity of grain has been incorrectly certified to conform to a specified grade or the authorized variations therefrom, or has been sold or offered for sale under any name, description, or designation which is false or misleading, he may publish his findings.

SEC. 6. That whenever standards shall have been fixed and established under this act for any grain and any quantity of such grain which has been sold, offered for sale, shipped, or delivered for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce shall have been inspected and a dispute arises as to whether the grade as determined by such inspection of any such grain in fact conforms to the standard of the specified grain, any interested party may appeal the question to the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause such investigation to be made and such tests to be applied as he may deem necessary to determine the true grade: *Provided*, That any appeal from such inspection to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be taken before the grain leaves the place where the inspection appealed from was made and before the identity of the grain has been lost, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture shall prescribe. In such cases the Secretary of Agriculture shall charge and assess and cause to be collected reasonable fees, in amounts to be fixed by him. All such fees shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The findings of the Secretary of Agriculture as to grade, made after the parties in interest have had opportunity to be heard,

shall be accepted in the courts of the United States in all suits between such parties or their privies as prima facie evidence of the true grade of the grain determined by him at the time and place specified in the findings.

SEC. 7. That no person authorized or employed by any State, county, city, town, board of trade, chamber of commerce, corporation, society, or association to inspect or grade grain shall certify, or otherwise state or indicate in writing, that any grain which has been inspected or graded by him, or by any person acting under his authority, is of one of the official grades of the United States unless he holds an unsuspended and unrevoked license issued by the Secretary of Agriculture authorizing him to inspect and grade grain for interstate and foreign commerce. The Secretary may issue a license to any person upon presentation to him of satisfactory evidence that such person is competent to inspect and grade grain: *Provided*, That in States which have State grain inspection established by law the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, issue licenses to persons duly authorized and employed to inspect grain under the laws of such States at the time this act goes into effect. Any such license may be suspended or revoked whenever the Secretary of Agriculture is satisfied that the holder thereof has failed to grade grain correctly, in accordance with the official grain standards of the United States, or has violated any provision of this act or of the rules and regulations made thereunder, or that the license has been used for any improper purpose whatsoever.

SEC. 8. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, from time to time, make such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary for the efficient execution of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. That every person who shall violate any provision of this act or of the rules and regulations made hereunder shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not exceeding \$200 for the first offense and for each succeeding offense not exceeding \$1,000. After judgment by the court notice thereof shall be given by publication in such manner as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe.

SEC. 10. That every person who forcibly assaults, resists, impedes, or interferes with any officer or employee of the United States Department of Agriculture in the execution of any duties authorized to be performed by this act or the rules and regulations made hereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not less than \$100 nor more than \$1,000, or be imprisoned not less than one month nor more than one year, or be punished by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 11. That the word "person" wherever used in this act shall be construed to import the plural or singular, as the case demands, and shall include individuals, corporations, companies, societies, and associations. When construing and enforcing the provisions of this act, the act, omission, or failure of any official agent, or other person acting for or employed by any corporation, company, society, or association within the scope of his employment or office shall, in every case, also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such corporation, company, society, or association, as well as that of the person.

SEC. 12. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$125,000, which shall be available until expended, for the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, including rent and the employment of such persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere.

PANAMA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair agreed to recognize the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] at half past 3, and that hour having passed, the Chair has now recognized him; but there is one bill on the calendar that, if it is ever going to be passed at all, ought to be passed to-day. That is the bill relating to the Panama-Pacific International Exposition. It is on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. It is the next bill on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. UNDERHILL], and after that bill is disposed of the House will recur to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] to suspend the rules and pass the grain-inspection bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 6454) to authorize the Government Exhibit Board for the Panama-Pacific International Exposition to install any part or parts of the Government exhibit at the said exposition either in the exhibit palaces of the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. or in the Government building at said exposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the Senate bill 6454. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Government Exhibit Board, created by the sundry civil act approved June 23, 1913, is hereby authorized to install, display, and maintain any part or parts of the exhibit of the United States Government at the Panama-Pacific International Exposition in the exhibit palaces provided by the Panama-Pacific International Exposition Co. or in the Government building provided for in the sundry civil act approved August 1, 1914, as the said Government Exhibit Board may determine.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. UNDERHILL, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

UNIFORM GRADING OF GRAIN.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second on the Moss bill for the grading of grain.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa if he is opposed to the bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. Not to the entire bill.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to oppose the bill, and I also demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania demands a second.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the amendments I have sent to the desk be read. One of them is to correct a misprint in the bill, and I ask that the other one be made a part of my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's first amendment was read into the bill. Now, the gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that another amendment which he sends up may be considered as a part of the bill, and the Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. by striking out, after the figures \$1,000, all of lines 13, 14, and 15, the language of which is as follows: "After judgment by the court notice thereof shall be given by publication in such manner as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe."

Mr. MANN. Is that a part of the motion?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to incorporate that into the bill as a part of his motion to suspend the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and for the purpose of making a parliamentary inquiry, would it be in order for me, not being a member of the committee, to offer an amendment?

The SPEAKER. No; nobody can offer an amendment, except by unanimous consent, after it has reached this stage. If the gentleman wants to ask unanimous consent, the Chair will put it.

Mr. MOORE. Then I ask unanimous consent to have the following amendment considered:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "district," strike out "or to any foreign country."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 12, after the word "district," strike out the words "or to any foreign country."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this amendment being read into the bill?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana and Mr. NORTON objected.

Mr. MOORE. What became of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss].

The SPEAKER. He had unanimous consent to make it a part of his motion.

Mr. MOORE. I did not understand that unanimous consent was given to consider the motion of the gentleman from Indiana. I reserved the right to object, and the Chair did not again ask whether there was objection. Action has been taken only on the request made by me.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Chair announced that the request of the gentleman from Indiana has been passed upon.

Mr. MANN. No; the Chair did not.

The SPEAKER. What the Chair announced was that the first amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana has been read into the bill. Then the gentleman from Indiana asked unanimous consent to read the other one in, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania reserved an objection. The Chair was under the impression that he had put the request, but he thinks the gentleman from Pennsylvania is right. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana to read this amendment which has been reported by the Clerk into the motion to suspend the rules?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has 20 minutes.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY].

[Mr. RUBEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] says, there is some objection to this bill, or at least to one phase of it, from the shipping interests along the Atlantic seaboard. It is contended that to require the inspection of grain that comes in bond from Canada, intended for export, will work a hardship upon the shippers generally and will not aid the farmers of this country who seek to be bene-

fited by the bill. I have asked to strike out that portion of section 4 which is objectionable to those interests.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman realizes of course that this provides that grain may be sold by sample or by any other designation which does not appear to be an imitation of the Federal grades. Does not that obviate largely that situation?

Mr. MOORE. No; the principal objection is that under this bill very large quantities of grain that come from Canada and are intended for export would be subjected to an unnecessary scrutiny and would very materially interfere with the export trade generally. That export trade, it is believed, is of great advantage to the farmers of the United States, particularly in regulating prices and in generally maintaining the business when there is no very great market at home for grain—corn and grain in particular.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman refer to grain that comes into Canada for reexport?

Mr. MOORE. That is what I said.

Mr. BORLAND. Does the gentleman say that it is to the interest of the farmer that that grain be excepted from the provisions of this bill?

Mr. MOORE. I will read to the gentleman a statement from the Commercial Exchange, of Philadelphia:

The export interests, although little known in the West, who naturally disregard us and look to their interests should be encouraged. It is a safety valve to the country.

These are business men—dealers in grain—who are speaking.

For instance, during the years 1892 to 1895 and in the year 1907 the grain export business largely helped to stop and settle panics by bringing gold into this country. The export interest makes the price and saves it from further decline for the farmer. The export interest takes the farmers' grain when it is not wanted by our millers and manufacturers. This is best illustrated by conditions every year early in the movement of crops. Domestic interests are unable to take care of the grain as fast as it moves from the farm, and some of it is not in condition that the millers and elevator interests desire it. The export market comes to the rescue of the farmer and stops the decline in price and opens a market for the farmers' grain.

I think that answers the question of the gentleman. Now I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] whether he can enlighten the House as to the application of that part of section 4 which provides that the inspection shall apply to shipments—

From any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country.

Large quantities of grain, as the gentleman knows, come in from Canada, and they are shipped through to foreign countries without breaking bulk, leaving it largely to the purchasers, the people on the other side, to determine whether the grain is satisfactory to them or not. The question I am raising is, Will this export grain, shipped in bond, have to stand the proposed Federal inspection? I would like the gentleman from Indiana to answer.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. As I understand the gentleman's question, it is whether a grain shipment originating in Canada and passing through the United States for export purposes, going through as it is now called "in bond," would come under the operation of this law. Is that the question?

Mr. MOORE. It is.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. It would not come under the operation of this law.

Mr. MOORE. If the gentleman will pardon me a moment. The gentleman heard the amendment I sent to the Clerk's desk and had read a little while ago?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I did. The purpose I had in objecting to that amendment is that if the proposed language were to be stricken from the bill our domestic grain going to foreign countries would not come under the provisions of the bill. The change would have no relation whatever with the question which the gentleman has in mind at the present time.

Mr. MOORE. If those words were stricken out "or to any foreign country," does the gentleman think that would relieve the situation entirely?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. If those words were stricken from the bill, it would simply mean that all domestic grain that is sold for export to foreign countries, or what we now know as our export trade, would not come under the operations of the bill, whereas the gentleman's question is, whether or not grain grown in Canada passing through the United States on its way for export would come under the operation of the bill. The domestic grain for export will come under the operations of the bill. Canadian grain passing through the United States in bond will not come under the operations of the bill. I will say to the gentleman I will be glad to put in the RECORD the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture, under

date of August 26, 1914, in which he answers the gentleman's question specifically, that grain passing through the United States in bond for export does not come under the operations of the bill. If the gentleman would like to have the Solicitor's opinion read, I will have it read in his time.

Mr. MOORE. I would be very glad to have it read in my time, because I am going to ask leave to insert certain documents which bear upon this question, as I expect to vote against the bill because of this paragraph, and I would be very glad to know on what the gentleman bases his opinion.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana: I send to the Clerk's desk the following letter to be read in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOWLER). The Clerk will read the letter in the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, August 26, 1914.

HON. RALPH W. MOSS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MOSS: Recently you informally requested my opinion as to whether H. R. 17971, in the form in which it was introduced by yourself on July 18 last, would interfere with or affect shipments of grain in bond from Canada to a port in the United States for export. I am very glad to give you my views on this question.

Section 4, which is the only section of the bill that need be considered in determining the question at hand, prohibits any person from shipping or delivering for shipment from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country, any grain which is sold or offered for sale by grade unless it be one of the grades fixed therefor in the official grain standards of the United States and the grain has been inspected and graded by an inspector licensed under the act and conforms to the official standard.

In order that this provision may apply to any particular shipment it must have its point of origin in some State, Territory, or District of the United States. In the case of a shipment of grain from Canada through the United States to some foreign country the point of origin would be in Canada and not in any State, Territory, or District of the United States. It seems clear, therefore, that the language of the provision cited would not apply to such a shipment.

There may be cases, however, in which the transit of grain from Canada is so interrupted that its export from the United States to a foreign country would constitute a new shipment and not merely a continuation of the original shipment. In such case the bill would seem to apply to such new shipment, but in general it is believed that it would not apply to through shipments of grain from Canada to a foreign country by way of the United States.

Very truly yours,

FRANCIS G. CAFFEY, Solicitor.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia is not wholly satisfied that that interpretation of the law will hold, but I am very glad to have it in the RECORD. I desire now to ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks a brief by the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia and a letter from the same organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain data. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE. I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has occupied 10 minutes.

The articles referred to are as follows:

THE COMMERCIAL EXCHANGE OF PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, August 13, 1914.

HON. J. HAMPTON MOORE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 5th instant asking if I have any suggestions to make as to bill H. R. 17971, which is a modification of bill H. R. 17329.

In reply, would say our position with reference to the grading of grain is the same as that set forth in our brief, under date of May 15, 1914, a copy of which was forwarded to you, and also the letter of our president to you, under date of June 23, 1914, referring to the grain-grades act, bill H. R. 17329. The modified bill, H. R. 17971, requires all grain to be inspected under Federal supervision in accordance with the standards of grade established by the Secretary of Agriculture, whether for export or consumption within the United States.

The export business is a world's proposition, and we must meet the competition and conditions of other grain-exporting countries. The Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, therefore, is unalterably opposed to Federal inspection or supervision of grain when intended for export. We believe it would be greatly to the detriment of the export business and to the producers in the United States, and would suggest that all grain for export, whether grown within the United States or elsewhere, be eliminated from the grain-grades act.

We are heartily in favor, however, of this bill in so far as it relates to the Federal supervision of inspection of grain for consumption within the United States, whether it be domestic or foreign grown grain.

Yours, very truly,

A. B. CLEMMER, Secretary.

THE COMMERCIAL EXCHANGE OF PHILADELPHIA,
Philadelphia, May 15, 1914.

HON. RALPH W. MOSS,
Chairman Subcommittee of Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully submit to you the following brief: The Commercial Exchange was founded in 1854. It is comprised of merchants in the grain, flour, hay, and feed business, manufacturers,

nearly all of the banks of Philadelphia, and all of the railroads and steamship lines. Through our exchange is handled all of the grain business, both domestic and export, that comes to the city of Philadelphia, amounting to from thirty to sixty million dollars yearly.

We have a most able and capable inspection department, and it is not in any way affiliated with the grain business, the rules of our exchange forbidding that. A more honest, conscientious, able, and careful staff of inspectors we do not believe can be found. Their salaries are paid by the exchange; their employment is assured as long as their work is faithful, efficient, and honest.

Referring to bill H. R. 14493, we have the utmost respect and kindly feeling toward your honorable committee and realize that you have a very big task before you, and with your kind permission we desire to take exceptions to the bill as relating to or governing export grain. We would gladly assist in the formation of a bill for uniform grading of grain for domestic application, but we most respectfully ask your honorable committee to exempt the export trade from bill H. R. 14493, or, if that be impossible, to then insert a section in the bill making the present grades of corn its basis of grade for export. We have been many years in building up the foreign grain business, and the changes, as proposed by the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, for the grading of corn would be a great hardship, completely upsetting the export business in that commodity, because—

First. During a very important part of the corn season, from December until the middle of June, it is impossible to get corn of the quality required by the honorable Secretary of Agriculture of the proposed grade of No. 2 corn at 15½ per cent moisture content in its natural condition. This would result in forcing exporters to sell the next lower grade, which is No. 3, as proposed by the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, with a moisture content of 17½ per cent. The foreigner would be compelled to buy that, because the other grade is an impossibility. To adjust the foreign buyer to this changed condition would be difficult and harmful.

Second. The difference between the proposed grades of corn is not a practical, merchantable difference. The 2 per cent moisture content between No. 2 and No. 3 and between No. 3 and No. 4 corn is too great. It will work a hardship to the producer. In this climate experience has shown that it is perfectly safe for us to export corn with 18 per cent moisture and give satisfaction to the foreign buyer. There should be a difference as to moisture content of corn for export between North Atlantic seaboard and the Gulf ports, because of the shorter journey and climatic conditions, which are more favorable for the grain carrying in good condition. We have the world's markets and conditions to compete with. Ours is not a domestic proposition, and that, we feel, should be considered.

The export interests, although little known in the West, who naturally disregard us and look to their interest and condition, should be encouraged. It is a safety valve to the country. For instance, during the years 1892 to 1895 and in the year 1907 the grain export business largely helped to stop and settle panics by bringing gold into this country. The export interest makes the price and saves it from further decline for the farmer. The export interest takes the farmer's grain when it is not wanted by our millers and manufacturers. This is best illustrated by conditions every year early in the movement of crops. Domestic interests are unable to take care of the grain as fast as it moves from the farm, and some of it is not in condition that the millers and elevator interests desire it. The export market comes to the rescue of the farmer and stops the decline in price and opens a market for the farmer's grain.

The seaboard grades of corn for export are about one grade lower than the western grades. It is very necessary for the large western terminal markets to have their corn grades higher than the seaboard, because they—the western markets—are compelled to carry their corn indefinitely. Their business is to accumulate the stock and carry it until there is a demand for it. This often results in stocks of grain, including corn, being held in the western markets month after month—and indeed, it has been held from one year to another.

The method at the seaboard is entirely different. Stocks are not carried for any length of time by exporters, but handled as quickly as possible. They do not bring grain to the seaboard unless there is a demand for it, because the proper place to carry it is in the West, or the source of the movement, and where it can be sent to any domestic market as well as to the seaboard.

If grain were brought to the seaboard without having a foreign demand, it might prove a very expensive experiment. From this you will see that by moving and handling without any delay or long term of storage grain is put into consumption and a moisture content of 15½ per cent is not at all necessary. We aim to give satisfaction to foreign buyers; our grades are doing that; and the moisture content of corn has been about 18 per cent.

Last year Philadelphia shipped 8,000,000 bushels of United States grown grain, about one-fourth of which was corn, and not a single complaint thereon; nor have we had a single complaint on any foreign grain since the bad crop of 1910 and 1911, which year the crop was improperly matured and was of a poor quality over nearly the entire United States. A great deal of it arrived at the seaboard out of condition from the West, and it was at that time or from that crop complaints were made; none to our knowledge since.

Third. We respectfully ask that Canadian grain in bond for export be exempt from any inspection in the United States. We do not understand that will be permitted according to section 5 and section 6. Much of our business in Philadelphia is bonded grain. Last year we exported 15,200,000 bushels, which, you will please note, is nearly double the amount of the United States grown grain that we exported through Philadelphia. Our total exports last year were 23,000,000 bushels, a smaller amount than we have often shipped before. The railroads and steamships, as well as the merchants, would be greatly injured if we were compelled to sell on United States grade only. The foreign grain buyer using Canadian grain does not wish to buy that on United States inspection, because in buying Canadian certificate of inspection only he is assured that there is no mixture of United States grain with the Canadian. The reason for this is plain. The Canadian grown grain is far superior in quality to that grown in the United States, their virgin soil producing a better quality.

Section 5, line 12, states that we shall not ship to any foreign country any grain unless the grade is fixed by the United States official standard, and section 6, line 4, states that "no person thereafter shall ship or deliver for shipment from any State, Territory, or District to or through any other State, Territory, or District, or to any foreign country, any such grain which is sold or offered for sale, whether by grade or not, under any name, description, or designation which is false or misleading in any particular." The provision in line 10 that "nothing contained herein shall prevent shipment or delivery of shipment, otherwise lawful, of any grain which is sold or offered for sale,

without reference to grade under the names, descriptions, or designations which are not false or misleading" does not, to our mind, give us permission to ship for export Canadian grain on Canadian certificates of inspection, because their certificates of inspection are very similar to the grades or inspections of the United States. Both countries use like terms. For instance, both have No. 1, No. 2, and No. 3 wheat, oats, flax, barley, and rye. The names and descriptions and designations would surely be misleading in that respect.

To injure this Canadian grain business, which to the port of Philadelphia is amounting to twice as much as the United States grown grain, would be a hardship to the port of Philadelphia, which affects the railroads and steamships; the latter failing to get cargoes are withdrawn and sail to more profitable ports. Removal of steamships injures not only Philadelphia but the entire State and neighboring States on export and import business.

Philadelphia does not see any need at this time to put a greater expense on the Government of the United States by changing the methods of handling and inspecting grain, which long years of experience have improved to about as efficient a condition as possible. An efficient force of Federal inspectors of grain would require, in our opinion, a much larger force than the meat-inspection department, which we understand is upward of 2,500 employees, and which we understand cost the Government some \$3,000,000 yearly. The grain business is vastly larger than the meat business. Of course, Federal supervision would not be so expensive, but should not the grain interests—meaning from the grower to the exporter—have the same privilege accorded them as the meat interests?—that is, no inspection charges are made for the inspection of meats. The grain interests would naturally expect to be placed on the same basis, or that no charges be made for the inspection of grain if done by the Government.

Fourth. The Federal supervision of corn only, as proposed by the honorable Secretary of Agriculture, would be most misleading to foreign buyers. They would suppose all grain was under Government supervision or inspection, and we believe if the Government is to take charge of the inspection of grain, it should be of all kinds of grain at the same time.

Referring to the trading in grain futures, there is no trading on our exchange, but many of our members use Chicago, Minneapolis, and New York markets. It is quite as necessary for a grain or flour merchant or a miller to insure himself against loss, either against the advance or decline of the market, as it is to insure houses, barns, or buildings of any kind from loss by fire or tornado; in fact, the risk is vastly greater.

For instance, we buy 25,000 bushels of wheat in Indiana for export; unless we happen at that time to have an order in hand that will pay a profit, we must sell an equal amount of wheat to hedge ourselves from loss in case of a decline in the market price. The expense of hedging or insuring is so small that it becomes a part of the cost for handling. If the market declines 2 cents a bushel, we can sell our 25,000 bushels of wheat at 2 cents decline, also, from the price at which we would have sold it at the time we bought it.

On the other hand, if one of our millers receives an order for 5,000 barrels of flour but could not at the moment buy the equivalent of 25,000 bushels of wheat to cover his sale of flour, he would buy, or should buy, 25,000 bushels in the market best adapted for his purpose to insure him from loss of an advance in the market.

Without this method of insurance against change in the market the grain dealers, millers, and merchants would find it necessary to have a much wider margin of profit, and this would mean a less price to the farmer. Business, of course, could be done again without trading in futures, but we would go backward about 50 years, and it would result in the big elevator interests and capitalists becoming more powerful than ever, because they would have the storage capacity and the capital to carry the grain in stock.

We thank you, gentlemen, for permission to file this brief, and regret exceedingly that the nondelivery of mail prevented our appearance. If you wish to question us by wire, we will answer immediately in that way. With the greatest respect and sincerity, we are,

Yours, very truly,

L. G. GRAFF,
GEORGE M. WARNER,
JAMES L. KING.

Delegates appointed by the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia to represent it at hearing on the "Lever grain-grading bill."

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

[Mr. SLOAN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEVENS].

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely regret that I am compelled to vote against this bill, as I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss] and his associates have labored so earnestly and with such a desire to produce a beneficial measure for the welfare of the agricultural interests of the country. But my district is the headquarters of the grain-inspection system of the State of Minnesota, and for more than 20 years our State has sustained one of the best systems in force in any State in this country. Its organization and the results of its work have been everywhere commended, and it justly possesses the confidence of our people. The Railroad and Warehouse Commission of Minnesota, as it is officially termed, is very strenuously opposed to this bill, because it believes that it would be greatly injurious to the agricultural interests of our section of the country. Early in the discussion the commission desired a hearing before the Committee on Agriculture, and the chairman, Judge Mills, sent me a telegram to that effect, which I delivered to the chairman of the committee, but by some inadvertence the commission was not notified, and, although the committee desired to hear from the commission and the commission was anxious to be heard, no hearing was had. I will send a telegram from the chairman of the commission to the desk to be read in my time. It is from the chairman

of the commission, Judge Ira B. Mills, who has served very faithfully and ably for many years, and it states the views of the commission of Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the communication referred to.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Hon. F. C. STEVENS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.:

This commission knows that several bills now pending before Congress will injure the northwestern grain growers, because they favor the buyer against the producer. The Federal rules for the grading of corn are impractical and have caused several losses to the growers, and local buyers can not comply with them. They were made by the theorists, who know nothing about grain conditions in the Northwest. If any of the bills now pending are passed, the grain business of the country will be demoralized and the producers be a large loser.

I. B. MILLS.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of the commissioners of the State, Mr. Jacobsen, who has had a very large experience as a member of the State board of grain appeals and later has served very acceptably upon the State railroad and warehouse commission, and has just been reelected to it by a large majority, during the summer came to Washington with the chief inspector of grain, Mr. Eva, also an official of large experience and splendid ability, and they conferred at some length with the officials of the Department of Agriculture in charge of this work.

Mr. Jacobsen set forth his views after such conference in a type-written statement, which I shall not read here on account of lack of time, but which I shall ask to have inserted as a part of my remarks, in which he outlined the basis for the telegram just read, which is substantially this: That the rules as laid down by the department are so theoretical and impractical that the grain buyer in the field will be compelled to buy from the producer at some grade below what the grain might possibly fairly produce, in order to protect himself, because of the uncertainty of the requirements. It is obvious these must be such as the buyer and producer can readily understand and carry out in everyday business, and the grades adopted are not at all of that character.

Mr. Jacobsen states that the grades as adopted by the Agricultural Department do not consider actual conditions of production and marketing. Where this is so, it is evident somebody along the line will suffer from the defects, and that somebody is always the farmer. The Minnesota commission is particularly the guardian of the agricultural interests of our State. When it solemnly expresses its deliberate judgment that this bill is injurious, I am bound to respect and follow such judgment. It seems to be a defect in the bill that in a State like Minnesota, which has a first-class system of inspection and grading already established and in successful operation, that the Secretary of Agriculture would have power to also license a competitive system of inspection by the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and by the Duluth Board of Trade, with exactly the same powers under this law. This will be encouraged and may produce chaos and injustice and injury.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to extend my remarks by inserting these papers and explanations in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

Following are the papers referred to:

ST. PAUL, MINN., December 21, 1914.

Hon. F. C. STEVENS, Washington, D. C.:

This commission knows that several bills now pending before Congress will injure the Northwestern grain growers, because they favor the buyer against the producer. The Federal rules for the grading of corn are impractical and have caused severe loss to the growers, and local buyers can not comply with them. They were made by theorists who know nothing about grain conditions in the Northwest. If any of the bills now pending are passed, the grain business of the country will be demoralized and the producers be a large loser.

IRA B. MILLS.

Previous to the year 1913 the Minnesota Board of Grain Appeals at their annual meeting adopted rules for grading of different kinds of grain. For a great many years this board had about eight rules for grading of corn—either white, yellow, and also for moisture.

In February, 1913, Congress passed a law that gave the United States Agricultural Department the power to grade corn, or, as we may call it, "Federal inspection" of corn. These rules were adopted by several of the Western States, and, among them, Minnesota. The reason for adopting these rules was on account of the interstate shipping. The Eastern States, such as Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts did not adopt the Federal grades, and therefore they are to-day buying our western corn according to Federal inspection and selling to European buyers on whatever grade they may put on the same. This shows that the producers of grain are the losers.

As stated above, Minnesota had eight grades, and the inspectors in Philadelphia and New York told Mr. Eva and Commissioner Jacobson

that when a car of corn arrived from Minnesota it was not necessary to reinspect same for outshippment, because they knew that it was inspected according to grades. When the Federal Government or Agricultural Department sent out their new grades, as promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture for the grading of corn, which took effect July 1, 1914, their rules affected about 22 different kinds of corn. The Minnesota appeal board did not think, when they adopted the Government rules, that they would overturn the grading of corn, as they finally did, because the grading of corn to-day is impracticable. No elevator buyer in the country can buy corn intelligently and expect to get either 2 or 3 grade, according to the new rules.

Early in the fall several corn buyers in the State wrote to the commission asking for advice, as they could not understand the new rules sent out by the Government. It was almost impossible for the chief inspector to answer these letters. Therefore the chief inspector and Commissioner Jacobson went to Washington, D. C., to get information from Dr. Duval, head of that department, and, together with Congressman ANDERSON, spent about two hours with him. It much surprised all three to see that his explanation was theory and lack of experience. Therefore we came away no wiser than when we went.

Mr. Eva, Commissioner Jacobson, and Mr. Evanson, of the appeal board, attended a meeting of the National Association of Grain Dealers held in Kansas City last September. Dr. Duval, of the Agricultural Department at Washington, was invited to this meeting to explain the grading of corn, but, to the astonishment of all present, he could not defend his position against the practical corn buyers of the United States.

I am of the opinion that hereafter all corn in the country will be bought as sample corn, because it is impossible for the country buyer to do it in any other way. Consequently, it will mean a great loss to the producers of the country.

So far I have given my opinion why it is impracticable. Now I will give you a few of the rules in the new grades. We shall pass the first two grades and take up what is called "No. 3 corn." This rule reads as follows:

"No. 3 corn: Shall be sweet, exclusive of heat damaged or mahogany kernels, and must not contain more than 17.5 per cent moisture, 6 per cent damaged corn, 2 per cent foreign material, 4 per cent cracked corn."

"No. 4 corn: Shall be sweet and must not contain more than 19.5 per cent moisture, 8 per cent damaged corn, 2 per cent foreign material, 4 per cent cracked corn, one-half of 1 per cent heat damaged or mahogany kernels."

"No. 5 corn: Shall be sweet and must not contain more than 21.5 per cent moisture, 10 per cent damaged corn, 3 per cent foreign material, 5 per cent cracked corn, 1 per cent heat damaged or mahogany kernels."

"No. 6 corn: Must not contain more than 23 per cent moisture, 15 per cent damaged corn, 5 per cent foreign material, 7 per cent cracked corn, 3 per cent heat-damaged or mahogany kernels. May be musty, sour, and include corn of inferior quality, such as immature and badly blistered corn."

They have another rule they call "Sample corn." That includes all corn that does not meet the requirements of either of the six grades by reason of excessive moisture, damaged kernels, foreign matter, cracked corn, hot corn, heat-damaged corn, fire-burnt corn, infested with live weevil, or otherwise distinctly low grade.

I did not mention the two first grades because that is easy enough for any buyer to buy from, but besides these six grades we have white corn, six grades, and yellow corn and mixed corn and finely broken corn.

The moisture percentages, according to those provided in grade specifications, shall conform to results obtained by the standard method and testor described in Circular No. 72, Bureau of Plant Industry, United States Department of Agriculture. Further than that, they have also a note that it is understood that the damaged corn, the foreign material, including pieces of cob dirt, finely broken corn, other grains, etc., and the coarsely broken or cracked corn as provided for under the various grades shall be such as occur naturally in corn when handled under good commercial conditions.

These rules undoubtedly read good and may be understood by theorists in certain departments where such work is performed, but it is impossible for any practical buyer in the country to know just how much moisture there is in corn when brought to the elevator, and it is impossible for such a buyer to determine the moisture content in his place. Under the old Minnesota rules it is true that it included moisture in the rules, but the practical buyers knew from experience what that meant, and the same when we speak about immature, badly blistered corn, foreign material, and mahogany color.

This, added to the above, I think, will convince any practical man that the so-called grades for commercial corn promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture, Washington, taking effect July 1, 1914, are impracticable for both State and interstate trade.

MR. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN].

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. HELGESEN] is recognized for two minutes.

[Mr. HELGESEN addressed the House. See Appendix.]

MR. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for two minutes.

MR. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this subject has been before Congress for a good many years. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at one time had jurisdiction of bills on the subject and had a number of hearings upon those bills. When the Moss bill was finally introduced I believe that was the result of various negotiations between people interested in the subject and was the outgrowth of several bills that had been introduced before.

I hold in my hand, for instance, a letter from the chairman of the Millers' National Federation Committee on Grain Standardization and Inspection, representing the millers of the land, very heartily approving the provisions of this bill. I also hold in my hand a letter from the secretary of the Chicago Board of Trade. While gentlemen speak of the Chicago Board of Trade

in language that is not particularly pleasant, still that is the great body in the country that handles grain. The Chicago Board of Trade has come to the conclusion that Federal supervision of grain is desirable and ought to be put into effect, and the secretary, who has had considerable to do with working out the solution of this problem in behalf of the Chicago Board of Trade and the boards of trade quite generally, speaks in behalf of this bill.

I believe that it will be a good thing if the bill be enacted into law. It does not go as far as some people desire; it goes further than other people desire. But it gives us Federal supervision and undertakes to provide a uniformity in the standardization of grain which can be understood by everybody.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

MR. MANN. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting these letters.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Following are the letters referred to:

BOARD OF TRADE OF THE CITY OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, July 24, 1914.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am in receipt of copies of H. R. 17971, introduced by Mr. Moss July 18.

The object of this letter is to acquaint you with the present situation in this association in the subject matter of the bill, because you may receive letters from members for or against the enactment of this measure.

Some two and a half years ago a committee of this association went to Washington to interview Dr. Wiley relative to rulings he had recently promulgated bearing on fermenting and heating corn and oats having weather stain artificially bleached off by the use of dioxide of sulphur gas, with the result that within a month thereafter delegates representing the exchanges and grain associations of the country, including farmers, to the number of 82 met in Washington to make a representation to the three Secretaries constituting a board of control of the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, the board at that time being composed of Secretaries Wilson, Nagel, and MacVeagh.

At a conference of the whole number in attendance, for the purpose of determining what should be presented to the Secretaries, the question of Federal inspection of grain was brought out by Mr. Brandeis, of Louisville—by the way, a brother of the well-known attorney—and he insisted that the Secretaries be informed that the grain interests of the country were in favor of Federal inspection of grain. A committee was finally appointed by the chair to draw up resolutions setting forth the attitude of the conference, on which committee Mr. C. B. Pierce, then a director of this association, a member of Bartlett Frazier Co., was a member. I was present as a delegate. This committee brought in a resolution, which was adopted, approving Federal supervision of grading of grain, but opposing Federal inspection. At the Norfolk convention of the Grain Dealers' National Association, held in October, 1913, delegates from this board participating, the resolution referred to was read and indorsed, thereby making it the action of the national body. In New Orleans, October, 1913, it was reaffirmed. The president and secretary of this association and other delegates were present and agreeing to it, therefore this association is committed to the principle of Federal supervision.

The bill herein referred to, in my opinion, can do us no harm. I have studied it carefully. Boiled down, it simply means that there would be Federal supervisors in our State inspection department in this city; that the appointment of our inspectors would remain as now, in the hands of our State authorities; that the interchanging of supervisors between markets would soon produce uniformity of grading throughout the country—this being the sole object of supervision, in order that No. 2 wheat or No. 2 corn may be of the same quality in all markets, which we believe would facilitate business with our buyers in this and foreign countries, the grade and quality being thoroughly understood, leaving price only to be adjusted to complete transactions.

I have met with representatives of the Department of Agriculture in conference with members of the Committee on Agriculture, and the statement was there made and agreed to that the rules and regulations to be made by the Secretary would be made after fully consulting with the grain growers and handlers.

I believe that we are more likely than not to have some legislation bearing upon this subject at no distant time in response to a more or less general demand. I believe this proposed measure will do us no harm, and perhaps another might, especially Federal inspection in the shape of the McCumber bill, would do us a lot of harm.

This association has held no public meeting to consider the matter, but it has been freely discussed for a considerable time, and I feel myself tolerably well qualified to express the conclusions of a major portion of our membership.

Yours, very truly,

J. C. F. MERRILL, Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 18, 1914.

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to my call on you this morning in connection with the Moss grain bill, H. R. 17971, I desire to confirm my statement that the Millers' National Federation, having a membership of over 1,000, favors the passage of this bill, believing it to be very much needed.

We do not believe that this or any other bill will or could be expected to eliminate all inspection or trade abuses. We believe, however, that this bill, if enacted, will decidedly improve conditions.

Yours, truly,

FRED J. HINGHAM,

Chairman Millers' National Federation Committee
on Grain Standardization and Inspection.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 18, 1914.

The Hon. JAMES R. MANN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The Millers' National Federation committee on grain standardization and inspection is as follows:

Mr. E. H. Evans, of Aeme Evans Co., Indianapolis, Ind.; Mr. L. R. Hurd, president the Red Star Mill & Elevator Co., Wichita, Kans.; Mr. John S. Pillsbury, vice president Pillsbury Flour Mills Co., Minneapolis, Minn.; Mr. B. M. Renick, secretary and manager the Paris Milling Co. and secretary-treasurer Central Kentucky Millers' Association, Paris, Ky.; Mr. Alexander Stock, of F. W. Stock & Sons, Hillsdale, Mich.

Mr. M. N. Mennel, president Millers' National Federation, secretary Central Freight Association of Millers, and treasurer the Harter Milling Co., Toledo, Ohio, has been in constant touch and in full accord with our committee.

From the above you will note that our committee is representative of many sections of the whole country, and also of flour milling businesses, both large, small, and of medium size. In fact, we believe that a request for assistance from our Federal Government in improving general trade customs and practices could hardly be more general.

Yours, truly,

FRED J. HINGHAM, Chairman,
Vice President Federal Milling Co., Lockport, N. Y.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SMITH].

[Mr. SMITH of Minnesota addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains to this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOWLER). The gentleman from Pennsylvania has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN].

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time allotted to me it is not my purpose to detain the House by entering into a detail discussion of this bill.

I believe it enough to say that the proposed bill provides for the standardization of grain for a uniform application of Government standards in determining the real grade of grain for which standards have been established and promulgated by the Secretary of Agriculture. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to fix, establish, and promulgate standards of quality and condition of corn, wheat, rye, oats, and other grains. The Secretary of Agriculture may issue license to a person competent to inspect and grade grain; that such license may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be suspended or revoked whenever the Secretary is satisfied that the licensed inspector has failed to grade grain correctly in accordance with the official standard or has violated any provision of this act or if the license has been used for any improper purpose whatsoever; also that no person shall certify that any grain which has been inspected or graded by him is one of the official grades unless he holds an unsuspended and unrevoked license issued by the Secretary of Agriculture authorizing him to inspect and grade grain for interstate and foreign commerce. Whenever standards shall have been fixed, established, and promulgated no person thereafter shall ship or deliver for shipment, sell or offer for sale, in interstate and foreign commerce any such grain by grade unless the grade by which it is sold or offered for sale be one of the grades fixed therefor and the grain shall have been inspected and graded by an inspector licensed under this act and the grade conformed to the standard fixed for the specific grade.

The practice of selling by sample, by type, or under name, description, or designation, may be continued, provided such name, description, or designation is not false or misleading. It provides further that whenever standardized grain has been inspected and a dispute arises as to whether the grain determined by such inspector of any such grain in fact conforms to the standards any interested party may appeal the question to the Secretary of Agriculture; if so, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause investigation to be made and to determine the true grade thereof, to charge and collect a reasonable fee in amounts to be fixed by him. In the absence of private agreement the appeal from such inspector to the Secretary shall be taken at the initial point and before the identity of the grade has been lost. The findings of the Secretary shall be accepted in the courts as prima facie evidence of the true grade. It also authorizes the Secretary to cause examination to be made of any grain for which standards have been established, which has been certified, or which has been sold or offered for sale in interstate and foreign commerce under any name, description, or designation, he may publish his findings. Heavy penalties are to be imposed for violation of the provisions of the act. The bill carries an appropriation of \$375,000 to enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of it.

As has been stated, the bill does not provide for Federal inspection and grading at first hand. It does provide for Federal supervision of the grading and final determination of the grade by the Secretary of Agriculture which, in fact, amounts to Fed-

eral inspection in the end. That is, if in case the inspection and grading by the licensed inspector is not satisfactory and an appeal is taken, the only difference then is that under the proposed bill the grain will in the first instance be inspected by inspectors authorized by the States, exchanges, or municipalities and licensed by the Federal Government, and if said inspection is not satisfactory either party interested may appeal and procure Federal inspection and determination, while with Federal inspection the grain would be inspected by a Federal inspector at first hand; but in case where an appeal is taken under either system the final inspection will be by one and the same, hence in the end, if an appeal is taken, we will have Federal inspection under either system.

The contention is that at present the inspectors are controlled and under the influence of the exchanges and interested parties employing them and therefore Congress should provide for Federal inspection and thus remove the inspectors from the influences surrounding them, such as the operators of exchanges, State politics, and interested parties who control their appointment. Undoubtedly inspectors are influenced and great injustice has been done to the shipper and buyer in inspecting and grading grain below its real grade when coming in and grading it above its real grade when going out for the benefit of the operators, manipulators, and jugglers of grading on the various exchanges; but when the inspector and those interested are made to understand that unless they do the right thing, that unless they grade grain correctly, appeals will be taken, fraud will be disclosed, licenses will be suspended and revoked, and publicity given to every evil practice of the kind. That, I believe, will have a powerful influence over the inspectors, States, exchanges, and those interested in maintaining the grain business at their market, and if the law is enforced and taken advantage of, no market can continue the evil practice of incorrect grading. If it does, it is sure to lose its business. If so, it will be up to every State and market to maintain an honest inspection and grading of grain or lose its grain business. Certainly no board of trade or market can afford to have numerous appeals taken and reversed, licenses suspended, and such facts published to the world. Under the bill, as a business proposition it will be to their interest to give a square deal. Be that as it may, whatever course they may pursue, the farmer, the miller, the brewer, the shipper, and the buyer are protected in their right to an appeal and thus have the true grade determined. Why this legislation? The answer is simply to do away with the present fraudulent practice in grading of grain, to protect the farmers, the elevator men, the millers, the brewers, the shippers, and the buyers against fraud, deception, to insure an honest grading, to do away with the manipulations of grades, and insure a square deal.

The farmer has long suffered from the fraudulent practice; his grain all these years has been undergraded. We find that his grain when it reaches the market is graded below its true grade, and, as the grade determines the price on grain, he receives a lower price as a result. Take, for instance, barley: If you would turn to the hearings, you will find Mr. Stuhler's testimony. Mr. Stuhler is a crop specialist and a barley expert, with many years' experience as a shipper and as an operator on the board of trade. His statement is that—

There is something absolutely wrong with the present system of inspection and grading of grain.

He cites one case where the farmer sold his barley at Wahpeton, N. Dak. His barley was graded No. 2 feed barley, subject to 2 pounds dockage, and sold at Wahpeton at 40 cents a bushel. The barley was shipped to Minneapolis—commission, freight, weighing, and inspection charges, 7½ cents. The barley sold at Minneapolis at 58 cents, not by grade but by sample, with a No. 2 feed barley certificate stam on it, even grading and certifying it as feed barley, when in fact it should have been certified as malting barley. Mr. Stuhler's statement is that—

Barley coming to Duluth and Minneapolis is generally inspected by the inspection department as feed barley in order to correspond with the inspection and grade given the farmer; that the terminal men, under the existing laws, have to send the certificate back to the country points, and the farmer is shown the certificate in order to pacify him who is under the impression that his barley was malting barley.

Thus the farmer is deceived and defrauded of the difference in value of No. 2 feed barley and malting barley, which generally runs from 5 to 15 cents a bushel. Mr. Stuhler stated to the committee that he collected and sent 30 or 40 samples of barley, all graded at Minneapolis as feed barley, to Pabst Brewing Co., to have them analyzed, and that every one of them, according to the analytical report, showed them to be malting barley. In other words, 30 or 40 samples, representing that many carloads,

graded feed barley at the initial point and graded malting barley at the analysis, such being the general practice. Has not the farmer a right to ask for relief?

How about the miller, the brewer, and the buyer? Under the present system of grading, grain coming in is graded low in order to defraud the farmer and the shipper; in going out it is graded high in order to defraud the miller and the buyer. The operator gets the farmer and the shipper coming and the miller, the brewer, and buyer going. A number of years ago a bankers' association of North Dakota investigated the inspection and grading of grain in the Northwest. In going over the records of the grain-inspection department of Minnesota it found that a single terminal elevator in a period of three months had advanced the grade on 435,618 bushels of wheat. Out of its total receipt of 890,245 bushels, evidently nearly one-half of the grain handled was either undergraded coming in or graded too high going out. The records showed that 59,742 bushels had been graded rejected, 16,021 no grade, 201,267 as No. 4, and not a bushel graded such going out. All were converted into higher grades, every bushel of it going out as 1, 2, and 3 northern. According to the report only 513,213 bushels was graded Nos. 1, 2, and 3 coming in, and 890,245 bushels graded Nos. 1, 2, and 3 going out. It is clear that the manipulation of grading was for some purpose and that whatever the elevator operator gained must have been some one's loss, and of course came out of either the shipper or the buyer, and in the end largely, if not all, out of the producer. The shipper and buyer often lose, but most of the time they can protect themselves against losses by fixing prices accordingly. If malting barley, when graded as such, is worth 50 cents and its selling price is reduced to 40 cents by reason of false grading, necessarily he pays that much less. If the brewer and the miller buy grain graded higher than its true grade, they have something to say in fixing the price and fix the price according to its real value. With the producer it is quite different. If the price of grain is lowered by reason of manipulation of grade, he is helpless. He simply has to take what he gets. So, while the manipulation of grades is greatly to the disadvantage of the shipper and buyer, the injustice and loss falls most heavily on the producer.

How about selling and buying for future delivery? We have the testimony of Mr. Stuhler, who sold 100,000 bushels of oats by sample for January delivery. He bought 100,000 bushels of standard oats which, by a purifying process, was to be made into fancy oats. He was buying the standard oats against what he had sold, and of course needed the quality of oats contracted for, namely, the standard oats. On December 2, 100,000 bushels of oats were tendered under certificate as standard oats. He had 10 or 20 cars of the oats tendered as standard inspected by a board of trade private inspector, who graded them as No. 4 white oats. He complained and took the matter up with the appeals commission. It passed on the oats as if standard oats. He served notice that he would take the oats under protest; that he would bring it into court and expose the rotten system. He was then told that the oats would be passed as standard in the East; but that did not help matters out, as he had bought oats to be made into fancy, and No. 4 oats could not be improved upon in grade to that extent and did not answer his purpose. What next? The firm financing him came to the rescue of the exchange by serving notice upon Stuhler to stop; if not, it would break up the Chicago Board of Trade. If he did not stop they would stop financing him. Of course he stopped, as there was nothing else for him to do. Others testified before the committee, and all to the fact that grading and certification of grain has become so unreliable and false that millers and buyers of grain no longer do or care to accept of grain on contracts certified by the terminal elevators; that they are compelled to sell their hedges for anything they can get and buy grain elsewhere for their use. Their experience has been the same as that of Mr. Stuhler; that their hedges are worthless except as an insurance, and as an insurance they have become very expensive by reason of the manipulation of grades.

It would seem that the statement made by those experienced, practical, and well-informed men who appeared before the committee—recorded in 588 pages of printed hearings before the House committee and 260 pages before the Senate committee—would be sufficient to convince anybody that there is something radically wrong somewhere. I believe that anyone who will investigate will agree that there is absolutely something wrong with the present system of grading grain, and that there is a pressing demand and just cause for the proposed legislation; that the farmers and shippers have sustained heavy losses by reason of this unfair grading and manipulation of grades; that our foreign trade in grain has suffered; that our markets have

been demoralized by the incorrect grading; that it is due the farmer and shipper that Congress should prevent further wrongdoing through this incorrect and unjust grading system; and that it should protect him against fraud and further demoralization of his markets.

The bill comes to you backed up by the unanimous report of the committee, by representatives of the Department of Agriculture, by representatives of legislative committees of the Grain Dealers' Mutual Association of Elevator Companies, and Farmers' Cooperative Association, who appeared before the committee and advocated the passage of the bill; by publishers, millers, and representatives of the boards of trade, chambers of commerce, and grain exchanges of Chicago, Louisville, Ky., Buffalo, Indianapolis, Peoria, Minneapolis, Duluth, Toledo, Omaha, Boston, St. Louis, Kansas City, Milwaukee, Baltimore, and others who appeared before the committee; representatives of the Warehouse Commission of Missouri; and Illinois State Public Utility Commission testified before the committee in favor of the bill. Mr. Stuhler, specialist and barley expert, speaking, I believe, for the brewers, indorsed it; in fact everybody expressed themselves in favor of the bill, except, as has been stated, a few exporters.

It would seem that in this Congress, its Members professing so much interest in the farmer and so much concern about his welfare, a Congress so enthusiastic in its laudation for the farmer, coupling this with the unceasing flow of eloquence recorded in several hundred pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, all indicating a desire to help the farmer in every way possible, and with the promises in the platforms of all parties so loudly proclaimed from the stump, I take it that there will be no difficulty in passing this meritorious bill which means so much to the farmer and shipper.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman from Iowa tell the House whether he holds the same opinion—he being the ranking Republican on the committee—that is held by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Moss], that this act will not apply to Canadian grain in bond intended for export?

Mr. HAUGEN. In my opinion it does not apply to grain shipped in bond from Canada for export.

Mr. MOORE. I thank the gentleman for that statement.

Mr. HAUGEN. But it applies to grain entering into interstate and foreign commerce.

Mr. SUMNERS. Are you in favor of the bill?

Mr. HAUGEN. I am in favor of the bill; yes.

In availing myself of the privilege granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, in order that the RECORD may show the existing conditions I offer extracts from the report as printed in Senate Document No. 116, page 17:

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION BY NORTH DAKOTA BANKERS' ASSOCIATION MADE NOVEMBER 23, 1906.

To Members North Dakota Bankers' Association:

Your committee appointed to investigate the subject of grain inspection and grading, as affecting the interests of North Dakota shippers, met according to arrangement at Superior, Wis., on the morning of September 27, and, after a preliminary discussion as to the scope of the investigation, proceeded to visit some of the terminal elevators in order to familiarize themselves with the methods of handling grain as it comes from the shipper. We found that grain is inspected, graded, and the dockage fixed by the State inspector under the rules of the Minnesota grain inspection board. The grain is then ordered into one of the terminal elevators and after being unloaded is elevated to the top of the elevator where it is weighed. During the process of elevating all grain is subjected to a suction draft in order to keep the building free from dust (?). This is an injustice to the shipper, as, in our judgment, all grain should be weighed immediately upon being unloaded and nothing should be taken from it before it is weighed. The amount of light grain and dirt taken out under the present method simply depends upon the force of the suction draft.

We obtained a statement showing the grain of various grades shipped in and shipped out from one of the larger elevators during a period of three months.

We find that eastern millers want the grain as it comes from the farmer, and it is an injustice to the shipper and to the miller to prevent this, as is now done. The shipper must accept the inspection, rules, and customs which have been forced upon him by the powerful combination of elevator and railway interests, and the miller must take the grain that is offered him by the "grain trust," so called, and not in the condition as to mixing that he wants it.

In examining the report, above referred to, of grain received and grain shipped out of the terminal elevator we were able to get a report from, we found that during the three months covered the report showed the following grain received and shipped out:

	RECEIPTS.	Bushels.
No. 1 northern	-----	99,711.40
No. 2 northern	-----	141,455.10
No. 3 northern	-----	272,047.20
No. 4	-----	201,267.20
No grade	-----	116,021.10
Rejected	-----	59,742.30
		890,245.10

	SHIPPED OUT.	Bushels.
No. 1 northern	-----	196,288.30
No. 2 northern	-----	467,764.00
No. 3	-----	213,459.30
No. 4	-----	None.
No grade	-----	None.
Rejected	-----	None.
		877,512.00
On hand, estimated	-----	12,733.10
		890,245.10

What an eloquent story is told by the above figures. The fact that nearly 100,000 bushels more of No. 1 northern, the highest grade taken in, was shipped out than was received speaks so loud against the present system and rules of inspection that it is simply unnecessary to go on down the line and call your attention to the fact that nothing lower than No. 3 wheat was shipped out.

The profit in mixing the receipts of this elevator for the three months, as shown by their report, was \$83,720.69. In order to arrive at the probable profits of the terminal elevators there should be added to the above the amount realized from the screenings, the charges for handling the grain, and the proceeds of the sale of wheat and other grain taken from the screenings, for we found that all screenings are carefully cleaned over and all good grain taken out, and that the good grain taken from the screenings is shipped out as screenings in order to avoid inspection and appearing in the amount of grain shipped out of the elevator. We are of the opinion that grain hospitals, either independent or in connection with terminal elevators, should be established, where shippers could have "off-grade" grain cleaned or scoured at a reasonable cost before it is offered for sale, the shipper to pay this expense and receive the benefit resulting from such treatment of his grain needing treatment in a hospital elevator. We also favor the amending of existing laws governing the handling of grain by terminal elevators so as to allow no more grain of a given grade to be shipped out than is taken in.

Your committee found much to criticize by visiting the freight yards, in the careless manner in which cars are handled by the railroad companies and the very poor class of grain doors used. The amount of grain lost by leakage from cars and by the careless shunting and switching of cars in the yards is very large.

All the foregoing are, of course, matters of minor importance as compared with the apparent combination of the railroad and elevator interests in forcing all grain received at terminal points to be inspected under Minnesota inspection rules. A competitive market was established under Wisconsin inspection at Superior. The Wisconsin law provides that the grain and warehouse commission shall consist of three members—one from Wisconsin, one from New York, and one from North Dakota. Under this law the shipper in this State has a representative on the board, and the influence of this representative can be of great benefit to our shippers if his duties are conscientiously performed.

This board appoints all inspectors and weighers and can see to it that inspection and weighing is honestly and properly done. Our shippers were undoubtedly greatly benefited during the time the Wisconsin inspection was in force, but by the apparent combined efforts of the interests above named this Wisconsin inspection is inoperative and all grain received at the head of the Lakes must be inspected by Minnesota inspectors under Minnesota rules.

The story of how the Wisconsin law was made absolutely inoperative is an interesting one. The Duluth Board of Trade made a rule that no member of the Duluth Board of Trade could hold membership in a similar organization within a hundred miles of Duluth. This was done

to compel all grain men doing business at the head of the Lakes to confine their business to Duluth. Then all terminal elevators located in Superior suddenly were closed as public elevators and became private elevators, operated by individuals holding leases. As private elevators, they were able to discriminate in the business offered them, and this discrimination took the form of refusing to receive grain inspected under Wisconsin rules and by Wisconsin inspectors. It does not require anything further to show you how Wisconsin inspection was put "down and out" and why all of our grain must now be graded, inspected, and weighed under Minnesota inspection rules.

Your committee attempted to have a hearing with the Duluth Board of Trade and met with some of the officers and members of that board for this purpose.

Your committee is of the opinion that the reforms outlined will be of material benefit to the grain growers of the State and will be a step-in-stone to a better system of inspection, viz:

Federal inspection, which would do away entirely with the many conflicting inspections established in the various States.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN L. CASHEL,
GEORGE M. YOUNG,
F. W. CATHERO,
M. F. MURPHY,
W. C. MACFADDEN,
Committee.

Also, page 231, hearings before the Senate committee in 1908, a report from the chief inspector of the grain and warehouse commission of the State of Minnesota, which show the receipts and shipments for the year ending August 31, 1901, to be as follows:

	Receipts.	Shipments
	Bushels.	Bushels.
No. 1 hard	341,567	1,000,433
No. 1 northern	10,070,414	16,900,917
No. 2 northern	7,341,594	3,978,311
No. 3 spring	1,335,830	444,041
Rejected	256,063	134,471
No grade	1,335,531	344,523

It will be observed that for the year 1902 about 5,000,000 bushels of the No. 2 northern was converted into No. 1, and that of the 19,693,454 bushels graded No. 2, 7,035,133 bushels No. 3 northern, 892,241 bushels were rejected, and 2,561,595 bushels, no grade; when coming in very little of it shipped out as such, the major portion of the lower grade going out at a high grade. The statement and reports tell the story. Comments seem unnecessary.

Another table, taken from the records of the weighing department of the State of Minnesota, shows the amount of each grade weighed in at, and the amount weighed out of, the elevator at Duluth during the years 1902, 1903, and 1904—found on page 207, Hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate, April 4, 1908.

The table is as follows:

Wheat.

[From annual reports Minnesota chief grain inspector for years named, Duluth weighing department.]

Grade.	Year ending August 31—					
	1902		1903		1904	
	Received.	Shipped.	Received.	Shipped.	Received.	Shipped.
No. 1 hard	599,606	648,607	1,628,681	1,746,712	90,543	109,523
No. 1 northern	15,187,012	19,886,137	21,905,842	23,606,721	12,401,897	18,217,789
No. 2 northern	19,693,454	15,178,999	11,625,037	7,638,201	10,295,172	6,723,732
No. 3 northern	7,035,133	1,971,355	1,300,553	297,794	12,616,065	1283,299
Rejected	892,241	94,626	1,890,093	77,624	2,350,302	314,133
No grade	2,561,595	468,922	966,170	112,840	2,586,843	256,943

¹Spring.

The following is a letter written by Robert A. Patterson, chairman of the European international committee on American grain certificates. He is an English miller and also president of the Corn Exchange of Great Britain and continental Europe. It is dated the 15th of February, 1908, and written from London to the President. It reads:

LONDON CORN TRADE ASSOCIATION,
EXCHANGE CHAMBERS, 28 ST. MARY AXE,
London, E. C., February 15, 1908.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am instructed by the European international committee on American grain certificates to communicate to you the following facts:

There has been for some years past a general consensus of opinion among European buyers of grain that the operation of the present system of certificating grain for export is increasingly unsatisfactory and that whatever may be its merits for the purposes of domestic trading, it no longer gives to European buyers the confidence and protection which is necessary in a trade where the only guaranty for reliable quality and condition in exchange for buyer's money is a paper certificate. For-

merly buyers in buying from the United States of America were able, as they still are in their dealings in grain with other exporting countries, to recover from shippers any damage they sustained owing to defects in quality or condition; but since the introduction of the certificating system this is no longer possible. Even after its introduction, indeed until comparatively recent times, it was seldom found that any serious abuses arose, and trusting to their belief in the reliability of the grading system, buyers were willing to continue trading with America on less favorable terms than they demanded elsewhere; but whether from the increase of individual competition, or, what is probably more important, the rivalry between the older ports and their smaller and more recently established competitors, there seems little doubt but that the standard of grading has been lowered, either temporarily or, in some cases, permanently, in order to attract business from interior points; and we in Europe feel that the burden of such departure from the more reliable and stricter method in force formerly has been borne chiefly by European importers, who, being far away, have no power of protecting themselves against errors, or worse, in the grading methods of recent years. The result is that American grain suffers as regards price when in competition with grain from other countries. The increasing dissatisfaction culminated some 12 months ago in a general request from the principal European grain centers that a conference

should be summoned by the London Corn Trade Association to consider the best measures to adopt in order to remedy the defects of the present system of dealing in grain from the United States of America.

The conference was held in London on the 8th of November, 1907, and was attended by delegates from all European importing countries. It was unanimously resolved that a committee be appointed, consisting of seven members from the United Kingdom and an equal number from other European countries (the latter being represented as follows: Belgium, 1; France, 1; Germany, 3; Holland, 1; and Scandinavia, 1), to suggest necessary improvements and to negotiate with American grain trade for their adoption.

This committee met and drew up a scheme (a copy of which I have the honor to append), which was submitted to the principal grain associations of the United States of America, but which, I regret to say, did not only prove unacceptable to the American exchanges, but even failed to draw any counter proposals from them. Indeed, the way in which this subject has been treated by some of the leading grain associations, there would almost seem to indicate that there is no desire to recognize the undoubted fact that serious faults have arisen or that there is any need to amend a system which is responsible for abuses of which European importers universally complain.

Traders here generally recognize that a reliable system of inspection and certificating presents many advantages, but that to be thoroughly reliable it must depend not only upon the expert knowledge, integrity, and independence of the inspection officials, but that the rules for grading by which these officials are bound must be uniform, applying equally to every port, and should be generally known not only in the various American but also in the principal European grain centers, and that wherever possible from time to time type samples should be sent to our leading grain associations.

This is the system adopted by the agricultural department of His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of Canada, and has hitherto proved generally satisfactory.

My committee observed with great satisfaction your reference to this important matter in your last presidential message, and that there is before your Senate and House of Representatives at the present time a bill embodying some of the above suggestions. While they would, of course, have preferred to get their own suggestions accepted by American traders, they wish to be permitted to offer you their sincere congratulations and thanks for the steps you are taking to remedy an undoubted evil, and to assure you of the warm support of the European grain trade in your efforts.

I have the honor to be, your most humble and obedient servant,
 ROBERT A. PATTERSON,
*Chairman European International Committee
 on American Grain Certificates.*
 The President,
 White House, United States of America,
 Washington, U. S. A.

In a letter to Senator McCUMBER, under date of February 15, 1908, he stated:

I believe that great efforts are being made to persuade your Senators and House of Representatives that the proposed change is not only unnecessary but not generally desired, but I can assure you that unless some such change is made, and that shortly, your export trade will suffer severely.

European buyers have lost confidence in the reliability of United States certificates, and American grain consequently suffers in price, buyers giving a preference whenever possible to other grain, and only buying yours when compelled to do so, or at a reduction in price sufficient, in their opinion, to compensate them for risks they run in buying certificate final.

Another letter from Holland and one from our consul at Marseille, which is also a very strong letter. The Holland letter reads as follows:

P. J. McCUMBER, Esq.,
 United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

During the last Berlin grain conference, held January 29 and 30 of this year by delegates of the German, Holland, and Scandinavian grain trade, the McCumber bill and the other bills of similar character introduced into Congress were one of the chief subjects on the program.

The question of American grain inspection has been a very important one these latter years, and its having been a subject of the conference program induces us to assure you of the sympathy that the proposed change in the inspection system has among the members of this association.

During many years already the American grain-inspection certificates have been very unsatisfactory, and immense losses were caused to the buyers on this side by the careless inspection of American grain shipped for export. It has been said by American opponents of the bills mentioned above that the fixing of grades on better and higher standards would injure the export trade, and that the European buyers will not buy anything but the grades which have always been shipped and to which they are accustomed.

We want to energetically deny that anything like this is the case or may be expected when Government grain inspection will have been introduced. On the contrary, we think that a more reliable inspection will greatly benefit the American export trade.

Many important firms in the importing centers on this side have absolutely given up importing American corn, taught by the experience of several years, when a single parcel of this article, certified No. 2 mixed, sail mixed, etc., and still showing 30 to 90 per cent damage on arrival, caused a loss greater than the small gain made on many shipments together. They preferred to buy from Argentina, Russia, and the Danube. A better inspection, however, and certificates which give sufficient guaranty that the grade has really been given in accordance with the grain's quality and condition will induce these firms to take up the import of American corn again.

We don't object to the export of inferior grain, but to the fact that the grades are not given according to the condition of the grain, so that the certificates are entirely unreliable. Perhaps some buyers on this side want the inferior grain, but those who deal in the better qualities want to be sure that when they pay a better price for the higher grade the certificate gives them the guaranty to get this grade. Up till now this has not been the case, and it is quite evident that a more satisfactory inspection will be of great benefit to the trade.

As soon as grades all over the United States are uniform, and as soon as certificates of inspection will be reliable, the import of American grain will certainly increase again after the sharp decline which it has experienced.

Uniform Government inspection will bring a higher standard of export grain, induce the European importer to buy American grain more freely again, and consequently greatly benefit the honest American exporter at the cost of his dishonest competitor. It will greatly purify the trade and make an end to an unbearable situation.

Yours, truly,

HET COMITÉ VAN GRAANHANDELAREN TE ROTTERDAM,
 (ROTTERDAM CORN TRADE ASSOCIATION.)
 A. COANEST, President.
 H. VON RANDERYTH, Secretary.

ROTTERDAM, February 20, 1908.

The letter from the United States consul at Marseille is in part as follows:

GRAIN-INSPECTION METHODS.

It is highly desirable that certain facts in regard to American grain-selling methods be given immediate and wide circulation, and that something be done, either by action of Congress or by the concerted action of American commercial bodies, to reform or rather standardize the system under which the great cereal-exporting business has been created.

There is little popular knowledge in the United States in regard to the fact that wheat, corn, grease, and similar products of American origin are not now sold abroad by sample, but by nominal grade. The European buyer knows nothing of the merchandise whatever before it reaches his possession. He imports and resells various classes of merchandise the quality or grade of which is certified to him, not by the merchant who has sold him the article, but by the official inspector of a board of trade or other equivalent body at the port of shipment. He pays for the goods before he receives them, and when the exporter in the United States delivers to him a certificate of inspection declaring the goods to be of a given grade he has no alternative but to honor the drafts. The bargain is absolutely final upon the production to him of this certificate of inspection.

Although no two ports in the United States may absolutely agree as to the descriptive terms to be applied to a given grade of wheat, although previous shipments may have been of obviously different quality, if the certificate delivered conforms to the grade ordered, the buyer must accept delivery. These are "American conditions." The fact that for many years we have exported nearly all our surplus agricultural products under these conditions speaks well for American business methods, and the fact that these methods are generally acceptable is of advantage to the people of the United States.

Of late years the murmurs against this system have been increasing in Europe, and whereas a short time ago they took the form of isolated private complaints that goods did not always conform to the certified grade they now take the form of organized protests. I have before me not merely private correspondence running through a number of years, but the recent proceedings of the London Corn Trade Association and the proceedings of a delegate conference held on December 12 at the Berlin Bourse, the general tenor of which is that foreign importers are vexed with prevailing conditions in the United States and are determined to force an improvement. At these two conferences a great many harsh things were said in regard to American certificates, and specific instances of irregularities were mentioned which I need not now repeat. The vital point which it will be well to separate from so much context is this:

"Mr. FRIEDBERG (Hamburg). It is perfectly clear that if an American inspector certifies we have no right to doubt, or if we do we are asked, 'Why do you go on buying?' I may assure this meeting that a good many of us are not going on buying. We have none of this trouble in South America. For the general trade I think that there are respectable people enough in America, and I am wondering why they do not stop the glaring abuses that are complained of."

It was the fact that not many years ago the vast bulk of our grain exportations went forward from New York, and that every year standard samples of cereals were sent out to European buyers bearing the seal of the New York commercial bodies which issued certificates of inspection. Under such circumstances, when European buyers received a certificate from New York stating that a certain cargo afloat was of X quality, they could refer to their sample of this X grain, and there was at least a moral guaranty that sample and cargo would be alike. The practice of sending out standard samples is no longer followed, while grain is being shipped under certificates of inspection from Duluth, New York, Baltimore, New Orleans, Galveston, and probably elsewhere. In each port or place a commercial organization assumes the right to issue certificates of grade, and yet no two ports or places have agreed upon the text of the terms which they use to describe the standard grades, let alone upon the grain itself. Nor is this all. I quote from the printed rules of a great board of trade:

"The committee on grain shall have full power and authority to establish grades of grains and to alter and amend the same as may be deemed necessary or expedient."

This instability is naturally one of the conditions of American business that is least acceptable to foreign importers, and what with rivalry between ports for export business it has created not only bitter feeling abroad but definite differences in the prices at which grain of the same nominal grade is offered for sale at the different ports of shipment. There are "easy ports" and "good ports," and sometimes the "easy ports" are penalized, as thus explained in a recent letter from an importer to an officer of an American commercial organization:

"As you know, at present exporters have great difficulty selling on certificates, but were quality is reasonably assured they are willing to pay a premium over lower inspections. Newport News and Norfolk were excluded on the London and Liverpool contracts because of last year's No. 2 corn shipments, while, as you know, your inspection maintained a premium all last season over the Atlantic."

No wheat importers desire to pay a premium here, or to exact a penalty there, based upon their appreciation of inspection methods. Wheat will fix its own price readily enough, and what the importer wishes to know, and has a right to know with as much certainty as attaches to any human transaction, is that No. 1 white winter wheat, for example, is the same kind of grain, whether it be inspected at Duluth or New Orleans. The importer insists that if the American Government, commercial bodies, and individual exporters have not agreed upon the qualifications of various grains necessary that they may receive specific gradings, it is the result of their own negligence, very possibly encouraged in certain quarters by those who profit by this unsatisfactory state of affairs.

The remedy sought is so easy of application and the demand for its application is so entirely reasonable that to the importer protracted resistance is incomprehensible. The proper remedy may be applied

either by our Government or by the cooperation of our trade bodies. The starting point of the reform would be, naturally, the establishment of standard descriptions by law. This done, if the Government were charged with the issuance of inspection certificates, the service would be removed from local influences, and our so-called official certificates would be rehabilitated. If this very rational proposition be objected to, the surest means of effectively combating it would be the holding of a conference of American grain-inspecting bodies for the adoption of grain standards and for the adoption of ways and means of drawing standard samples, to be deposited in American consulates at great European ports or to be issued upon demand to importers, and to provide for a board of inspectors, the members thereof to be transferred at intervals and liberated from every form of local pressure.

ROBERT P. SKINNER,
Consul General.

MARSEILLE, December 8, 1906.

Also, in order that the RECORD may show how the manipulation of grades affect our foreign markets, I will include correspondence printed in Senate Document No. 116 and hearings before the Senate committee:

Mr. Tedford, State grain inspector of Kansas, testified that the standard of grades going out of elevators was the minimum or lowest character of grade, while others testified that of the grain as it went into elevator the lowest grade in the car was the standard.

On pages 788, 789, Mr. Bevan testified as to the custom of "car plugging," and gave instances of where from 150 to 200 cars were so plugged, and described the plugging system as follows:

"Q. What is the practice of plugging cars?"

Mr. Bevan answered:

"It is putting a poor grade on the bottom and covering it with good stuff, so the inspector can not get at it. They have what is called 'trier' to push into the car. If it does not go deep enough, he does not know the poor stuff is there."

On page 790 Mr. Forsyth testified to his knowledge of the plugging of wheat going to public elevators, as follows:

"They would run up tailings, bin-burned wheat, stumpy wheat—all inferior grades of wheat they had in the house—in one spot and run contract wheat in the others. They would get a string of cars in and give me the capacities and tell me how much to drop, as they call it, of the 'dope.' I would drop it, and when I got that dropped I would drop contract on top of it."

GRAIN-TRADE COMPLAINTS AS REPORTED BY AMERICAN CONSULS, AND CONSEQUENT LOSS TO AMERICAN PRODUCER.

Consul Thomas R. Wallace, in a report from Crefeld, says that the grain dealers in northern and western Europe have been holding meetings, the principal purpose of which seems to be to take united action with regard to a change in the rules and methods of transacting business with the United States in their line and to correct abuses now existing in the same. The consul continues:

"The grain trade from the United States with this district has been declining for some time, and if such dissatisfaction becomes general throughout Europe the losses to the people of America in this important branch of their export trade will be enormous. To gain some idea of the causes of the complaints regarding the grain exported from the United States I have made personal inquiry among the millers and dealers in these products, and am told that the conditions complained of here are the same all over Europe.

"The dealers say they have suffered excessive losses through the purchase of grain from America by its not grading up to the standard given in the inspector's certificate in kind, quality, or condition when received. Wheat sold as good winter wheat and so certified to by the inspector, is very often found to be new wheat mixed with old and often wormy wheat. Grain often arrives in very bad condition. Wheat purchased as new is found weevilly—very good wheat with badly damaged grain mixed with it.

"They say, further, that the American shippers well know these facts, but of late years refuse to take these precautions, and because of the rule that the inspector's certificate is final the purchaser is compelled to suffer the loss arising from this negligence of the shipper. If the purchaser presents a claim for loss caused by grain received in bad condition, or of inferior quality from that certified to by the inspector, he receives no satisfaction from the shipper.

"UNITED STATES ALONE TO BLAME.

"I am informed that such conditions have become worse; that the purchaser here does not receive what he buys, and that no reliance can be placed on the inspector's certificate. The result is the miller has ceased to buy American grain for his mill and the farmer for his stock. It is further said that grain received from South America, Russia, or Roumania arrives in good condition, that received from the United States alone being bad.

"A general meeting of those engaged in the grain trade was held in 1905 by representatives from Holland and Germany. A meeting was held in London in November last, in which appeared representatives from Germany, France, Holland, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, and England, Ireland, and Scotland, and still another meeting was held on December 12 at Berlin. At all of these assemblies the principal topic for discussion was methods to correct the alleged abuses in the grain trade with the United States.

"COERCIVE MEASURES THREATENED.

"The dealers having radical or extreme views do not believe that an amicable settlement of the matter can be made with the shippers unless coercive measures are used, and this is one of the reasons of the international character of these assemblies. It is said by them that some of the same conditions prevailed in the grain trade with Russia some time ago. The Russian dealers were invited to Berlin to a conference, but treated the action with indifference, whereupon the German dealers refused to buy any Russian grain, and in a short time Russia asked for a meeting.

"The seriousness of this movement, threatening the loss of trade in this important branch of American exports, should not be underestimated. It is general in its character and covers the countries buying about all of the surplus crops of the United States.

"The unanimity of sentiment expressed at these meetings indicates there must be good cause for complaint, and as representatives of nearly all the nations of Europe are taking part in these assemblies and the meetings have become international in character. It is time the American people, who are interested in this great and important branch of the Nation's industries and commerce, should take some action to preserve it from further losses."

FRANCE.

FAULTY AMERICAN GRAIN-INSPECTION METHODS.

Consul General Robert P. Skinner, of Marseille, thinks it is highly desirable that certain facts in regard to American grain-selling methods be given immediate and wide circulation, and that something be done either by action of Congress or by the concerted action of American commercial bodies to reform or, rather, standardize the system under which the great cereal-exporting business has been created. Mr. Skinner writes:

"There is little popular knowledge in the United States in regard to the fact that wheat, corn, grease, and similar products of American origin are not now sold abroad by sample, but by nominal grade. The European buyer knows nothing of the merchandise whatever before it reaches his possession. He imports and resells various classes of merchandise the quality or grade of which is certified to him, not by the merchant who has sold him the article, but by the official inspector of a board of trade or other equivalent body at the port of shipment. He pays for the goods before he receives them, and when the exporter in the United States delivers to him a certificate of inspection, declaring the goods to be of a given grade, he has no alternative but to honor the drafts. The bargain is absolutely final upon the production to him of this certificate of inspection.

"STRENUOUS OBJECTIONS.

"Of late years the murmurs against this system have been increasing in Europe, and whereas a short time ago they took the form of isolated private complaints that goods did not always conform to the certified grade, they now take the form of organized protests. I have before me not merely private correspondence running through a number of years, but the recent proceedings of the London Corn Trade Association and the proceedings of a delegate conference held on December 12 at the Berlin Bourse, the general tenor of which is that foreign importers are vexed with prevailing conditions in the United States and are determined to force an improvement. At these two conferences a great many harsh things were said in regard to American certificates and specific instances of irregularities were mentioned. The vital point, which it will be well to separate from so much context, is this:

"Mr. Friedberg (Hamburg) stated: 'It is perfectly clear that if an American inspector certifies we have no right to doubt, or if we do we are asked, Why do you go on buying?' I may assure this meeting that a good many of us are not going on buying. We have none of this trouble in South America. For the general trade I think that there are respectable people enough in America, and I am wondering why they do not stop the glaring abuses that are complained of.'

"This instability is naturally one of the conditions of American business that is least acceptable to foreign importers, and what with rivalry between ports for export business, it has created not only bitter feeling abroad, but definite differences in the prices at which grain of the same nominal grade is offered for sale at the different ports of shipment. There are 'easy ports' and 'good ports,' and sometimes the 'easy ports' are penalized, as thus explained in a recent letter from an importer to an officer of an American commercial organization:

"As you know, at present importers have great difficulty selling on certificates, but where quality is reasonably assured they are willing to pay a premium over lower inspections. Newport News and Norfolk were excluded on the London and Liverpool contracts because of last year's (1905) No. 2 corn shipments, while, as you know, your inspection maintained a premium all last season over the Atlantic."

"SIMPLE REMEDY PROPOSED.

"The remedy sought is so easy of application and the demand for its application is so entirely reasonable that to the importer protracted resistance is incomprehensible. The proper remedy may be applied either by the American Government or by the cooperation of American trade bodies. The starting point of the reform would be, naturally, the establishment of standard descriptions by law. This done, if the Government were charged with the issuance of inspection certificates the service would be removed from local influences and the so-called official American certificates would be rehabilitated. If this very rational proposition be objected to, the surest means of effectively combating it would be the holding of a conference of American grain-inspecting bodies for the adoption of grain standards and for the adoption of ways and means of drawing standard samples, to be deposited in American consulates at great European ports or to be issued upon demand to importers, and to provide for a board of inspectors, the members thereof to be transferred at intervals and liberated from every form of local pressure."

Consul General Skinner, of Marseille, France, under date of January 10, 1907, writes as follows:

"In continuation of my report, dated December 18, 1906, I wish to say that my attention had been called to a report presented to the Syndical Chamber of Grain and Flour, at Paris, by George Lefebvre, delegate to the International Reunion, organized by the London Corn Trade Association. This report has been sent to me by a prominent Marseille miller, and I take it that it is a résumé of the sentiments of the trade in this city, which has not acted upon the subject as yet in an official manner, although at this port the great bulk of American hard-wheat exportations are received. The report of M. Lefebvre is quite long, and I translate merely the salient passages, as follows:

"I have the honor to render an account of my mission as your representative at the conference of November 8, organized by the London Corn Trade Association for the purpose of considering final certificates covering grain exportations from America. The conference was attended by not less than 45 members, whose opinions were unanimous as to the necessity of reforming the actual system. Some wished to ameliorate it and others to abolish it. Complaints were made of a detailed nature, which I have no need here to repeat, except as to two cases, which deserve to be set forth.

"Complaint was made in regard to the delivery of hard winter wheat No. 2, in which not only the old and the new crop were mixed, but in which there was to be found also a considerable quantity of seriously damaged wheat. From the American inspectors who delivered the certificates, the only answer received was this: 'We consider our principal duty is to secure the consumption of our crop.'

"Corn certified as No. 2 or 'sail grade' (the quality capable of supporting a voyage in sailing ships) and which should have been able to endure a long voyage, arrived in a completely bad condition after a rather short journey. The complaint made was met by the reply that 'It is the fault of the buyers who purchase during the months when corn germinates.'

"Mr. Montgomery, of Liverpool, speaking first, declared that the inspection service was badly established in the United States; that the European buyer renouncing any right of appeal as to quality when an

Inspector has delivered a certificate, thus constituting the inspector an arbitrator between the seller in America and the receiver in Europe.

"The abuses concerning which complaints arise from all parts of Europe prove that the buyers must come to an understanding, in order to determine the methods by which this business should be handled between America and the Old World. This conference is probably the first effort along these lines between the interested countries.

"First of all, what is it that is called an 'official' certificate of inspection as to quality? This is a very broad definition. There is not in the trade any definition of the word 'official,' and in consequence every certificate of an inspector who holds an official position must be accepted by the buyer."

CANADA.

The following Associated Press dispatch is corroborated by the Agricultural Department:

"GRASS SEED IS BEING DOPED WITH ADULTERATIONS FROM CANADA.

"WASHINGTON, February 13, 1907.

"The Department of Agriculture has issued a circular relative to the investigation of the adulteration of orchard grass, bluegrass, clover, and alfalfa seed. The department gathered seed from all parts of the United States, buying in the open market, and of the seed examined about one-third was found adulterated. The degrees of adulteration varied from 10 per cent to 75 per cent. The names of upward of a hundred firms which the department alleges are selling adulterated seeds are printed in the circular. It is estimated that 700,000 pounds of Canadian bluegrass seed are annually imported into the United States and mixed with Kentucky bluegrass seed and sold as the latter. A similar amount of trefoll is imported from England, mixed with alfalfa seeds, and sold at a corresponding advance, says the circular."

SCOTLAND.

AMERICAN FLOUR HURT BY MISBRANDING.

Consul R. W. Austin, of Glasgow, writes that the friends of American flour in Scotland are elated over the passage by Congress of "the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906," and are predicting that with the enforcement of the law mentioned the American flour will regain its old-time reputation and be restored to the head of the list which it occupied in Great Britain prior to 1904. Mr. Austin continues:

"At that time no flour—home or foreign—equalled the American article, which had grown in popular favor to such an extent that it had no real competitor.

"The American wheat crop of 1904 being short, enabled the continental mills to introduce their flour into Scotland, many of them not hesitating to use popular American labels. This scheme was worked successfully for some time, to the injury of the American trade and the excellent reputation of its flour. Finally a vigorous protest under the British 'sale-of-goods act' was made, and this practice of the millers of the Continent discontinued. While this afforded relief, American flour is, and has been for several years, seriously injured in Great Britain by its being misbranded or labeled before leaving America, and this unfair method, it is hoped, will be discontinued by an observance of the 'food and drugs act.'"

Mr. MOORE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I voice the news and interests of the largest grain-shipping port in America, namely, the city of Baltimore. The city of Baltimore can, through its system of modern elevators, handle something over 2,000,000 bushels of grain a day. It is the nearest port on the Atlantic seaboard to the great grain-producing sections of the Middle West, and for that reason it is the channel through which passes a large amount of our grain shipped abroad. Those interested in the grain business of Baltimore have written me in opposition to this provision, and I have been urged by the chamber of commerce of our city to record my vote against it when it is brought before this House. Our city has established a reputation throughout the country for grain inspection, and that inspection is regarded by grain merchants and others in this country and throughout the world as being in every way acceptable. I am told that the passage of this provision will be of no benefit to those affected by it, but, on the contrary, will work considerable harm. I therefore call the attention of this House to the views and attitude of those men of Baltimore who are versed and experienced in this business, and submit to this House that the apprehensions of these men and their views in this matter, which is one affecting their livelihood, should receive our careful consideration before we take action which may be decidedly prejudicial to them. It is because of these statements and this attitude of the business men of my city that I object to this provision and why I oppose it on this floor.

Mr. MOORE. Will the gentleman from Indiana use any of his time?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. I shall close in one speech if we have any remarks at all.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Committee on Agriculture on the fact that this bill, if enacted, will be clearly within the constitutional powers of Congress, which its companion, the Lever bill, as clearly is not. I want to call attention to section 7, to some obvious defects which I hope may be remedied by unanimous consent. The proviso in lines 17 to 21, page 6, reads:

Provided, That in States which have State grain inspection established by law the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, issue licenses to persons duly authorized and employed to inspect grain under the laws of such States at the time this act goes into effect.

Now, surely it could not have been the intention of the committee to limit the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to issue licenses to persons employed by the State who may be employed at the time this act goes into effect. Clearly it must have been the intention to authorize the Secretary to issue licenses to any inspectors employed by the State at any time. I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the motion an amendment to strike out the words in line 4, page 6, "at the time this act goes into effect."

Mr. MANN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. LENROOT. To strike out the words, on page 6, line 21, "at the time this act goes into effect."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 21, after the word "States," strike out the words "at the time this act goes into effect."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to read into the motion the amendment that has just been reported. Is there objection?

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, and I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] has no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Now, Mr. Speaker, one further defect. At the beginning of section 7 it provides—

That no person authorized or employed by any State, county, city, town, board of trade, chamber of commerce, corporation, society, or association to inspect or grade grain shall certify, or otherwise state or indicate in writing, that any grain which has been inspected or graded by him, or by any person acting under his authority, is of one of the official grades of the United States—

And so forth.

This prohibition ought not to be limited to those persons who may be employed by a city, county, or State. This prohibition should be general, that no person should be permitted to certify that it is an official grade of the United States unless he has been licensed under the Federal law. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be included in section 7, striking out all of line 5 after the word "included" down to and including the word "grain," in line 8.

Mr. MANN. That would prohibit a Federal official from so certifying.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that.

Mr. LENROOT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that it will be considered when it gets into conference, for it should be remedied.

Mr. MOSS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and after obtaining that permission I ask that we take a vote. I have no further debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill with the amendments read into it.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MOORE) there were 98 ayes and 11 noes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 221, nays 17, answered "present" 1, not voting 188, as follows:

YEAS—221.

Abercrombie
Adamson
Alexander
Anderson
Ashbrook
Aswell
Baker
Barkley
Barnhart
Bathrick
Beakes
Beall, Tex.
Bell, Cal.
Blackmon
Booher
Borland
Brockson
Brodbeck
Brown, W. Va.
Bryan
Bulkey
Burgess

Burke, S. Dak.
Burnett
Butler
Byrnes, S. C.
Byrns, Tenn.
Calder
Campbell
Candler, Miss.
Cantrill
Caraway
Carlin
Carter
Collier
Conry
Cooper
Cox
Cramton
Crisp
Crosser
Cullop
Curry
Danforth

Decker
Dickinson
Dies
Difenderfer
Dillon
Donovan
Doolittle
Doremus
Doughton
Dupré
Eagle
Esch
Falconer
Fe. gusson
Ferris
Fess
Fields
Finley
FitzHenry
Flood, Va.
Foster
Fowler

Francis
Frear
Gallagher
Gallivan
Gard
Gardner
Garner
Garrett, Tenn.
Gill
Glass
Goetze
Gray
Greene, Mass.
Greene, Vt.
Gudger
Hamilton, Mich.
Hamlin
Hardy
Harrison
Hart
Haugen
Hawley

Hay	Leshner	Phelan	Sutherland.
Hayden	Lever	Platt	Switzer
Hayes	Lindbergh	Plumley	Taggart
Heflin	Lobeck	Pou	Talcott, N. Y.
Helgesen	Loneragan	Prouty	Tavener
Helm	McAndrews	Quin	Taylor, Ala.
Henry	McGillcuddy	Rainey	Taylor, Ark.
Hensley	McLaughlin	Raker	Taylor, Colo.
Hill	MacDonald	Rauch	Temple
Holland	Maguire, Nebr.	Reed	Ten Eyck
Houston	Mahan	Reilly, Conn.	Thacher
Howard	Mann	Reilly, Wis.	Thomas
Howell	Mapes	Rogers	Thomson, Ill.
Hoxworth	Martin	Rouse	Treadway
Hughes, Ga.	Metz	Rubey	Tribble
Hull	Miller	Russell	Underhill
Humphrey, Wash.	Mitchell	Seldomridge	Underwood
Humphreys, Miss.	Montague	Shackleford	Vaughan
Igoe	Moon	Sherley	Vinson
Jacoway	Morgan, Okla.	Sims	Vollmer
Johnson, Ky.	Morrison	Slomp	Volstead
Kahn	Moss, Ind.	Sloan	Watkins
Keating	Neeley, Kans.	Smith, J. M. C.	Watson
Kelly, Pa.	Nelson	Smith, Minn.	Weaver
Kettner	Nolan, J. I.	Smith, N. Y.	Webb
Key, Ohio	Norton	Smith, Tex.	Williams
Kindel	O'Brien	Stafford	Willis
Kinkaid, Nebr.	Oldfield	Stedman	Wingo
Konop	Page, N. C.	Steenerson	Woods
Korbly	Palmer	Stephens, Cal.	Young, N. Dak.
Lafferty	Park	Stephens, Tex.	Young, Tex.
La Follette	Parker, N. J.	Stone	
Lazaro	Patton, Pa.	Stringer	
Lenroot	Peterson	Summers	

NAYS—17.

Bailey	Hinds	Logue	Small
Edmonds	Johnson, Utah	Moore	Stevens, Minn.
Fairchild	Johnson, Wash.	Murray	
Fitzgerald	Levy	Sherwood	
Gordon	Linthicum	Sisson	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Browning

NOT VOTING—188.

Adair	Dershem	Keister	Post
Aiken	Dixon	Kelley, Mich.	Powers
Ainey	Donohoe	Kennedy, Conn.	Price
Allen	Doolling	Kennedy, Iowa	Ragsdale
Ansberry	Driscoll	Kennedy, R. I.	Rayburn
Anthony	Drukker	Kent	Riordan
Austin	Dunn	Kiess, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Avis	Eagan	Kinkaid, N. J.	Roberts, Nev.
Baltz	Edwards	Kirkpatrick	Rothermel
Barchfeld	Elder	Kitchin	Rucker
Bartholdt	Estopinal	Knowland, J. R.	Rupley
Bartlett	Evans	Kreider	Sabath
Barton	Faison	Langham	Saunders
Bell, Ga.	Farr	Langley	Scott
Borchers	Floyd, Ark.	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Bowdle	Fordney	Lee, Pa.	Sells
Britten	French	L'Engle	Shreve
Broussard	Garrett, Tex.	Lewis, Md.	Sinnott
Brown, N. Y.	George	Lewis, Pa.	Slayden
Browne, Wis.	Gerry	Lieb	Smith, Idaho
Bruckner	Gillett	Lindquist	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	Gilmore	Lloyd	Smith, Saml. W.
Buchanan, Ill.	Gittins	Loft	Sparkman
Buchanan, Tex.	Godwin, N. C.	McLellan	Stanley
Burke, Pa.	Goldfogle	McGuire, Okla.	Stephens, Miss.
Burke, Wis.	Good	McKellar	Stephens, Nebr.
Callaway	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Stevens, N. H.
Cantor	Gorman	Madden	Stout
Carew	Goulden	Maher	Talbot, Md.
Carr	Graham, Ill.	Manahan	Taylor, N. Y.
Cary	Graham, Pa.	Mandell	Thompson, Okla.
Casey	Green, Iowa	Morgan, La.	Towner
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	Morin	Townsend
Church	Griest	Moss, W. Va.	Tuttle
Clancy	Griffin	Mott	Vare
Clark, Fla.	Guernsey	Mulkey	Walker
Claypool	Hamill	Murdoch	Wallin
Cline	Hamilton, N. Y.	Neely, W. Va.	Walsh
Coady	Hammond	Oglesby	Walters
Connelly, Kans.	Harris	O'Hair	Whaley
Connelly, Iowa	Helvering	O'Shaunessy	Whitacre
Copley	Hinebaugh	Padgett	White
Dale	Hobson	Paige, Mass.	Wilson, Fla.
Davenport	Hughes, W. Va.	Parker, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
Davis	Hullings	Patten, N. Y.	Winslow
Deitrick	Johnson, S. C.	Peters	Witherspoon
Dent	Jones	Porter	Woodruff

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

For the session:

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. BROWNING.

Until further notice:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. GRIEST.

Mr. EVANS with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. BROWN of New York with Mr. WALTERS.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. CLINE with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. DENT with Mr. LINDQUIST.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. FRENCH.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. GREEN of Iowa.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. GILLET.

Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. SMALL with Mr. MANAHAN.

Mr. STANLEY with Mr. MONDELL.

Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. STOUT with Mr. SCOTT.

Mr. WHITE with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. TUTTLE with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. WINSLOW.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

HOUR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, having in charge the Indian appropriation bill, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. QUIN. I rise to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects. Really, as a matter of fact, it is too late.

ENLARGEMENT OF WALL STREET FRONT, ASSAY OFFICE, NEW YORK.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to vacate the order by which Senate bill 3342 was passed to-day and to lay the bill on the table. A similar House bill has already passed the Senate and been approved.

The SPEAKER. What is the number?

Mr. FITZGERALD. S. 3342.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent to vacate the order by which Senate bill 3342 was passed and to lay the same on the table. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. There is a communication here from the Secretary of the Treasury, a letter which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, that ought to have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations (H. Doc. No. 1427). Without objection, it will be so referred.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER requests leave of absence January 5 and 6, on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I object—on account of important business?

The SPEAKER. On account of important official business.

Mr. DONOVAN. I do not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, January 5, 1915, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 20525) to establish a standard of weights for various commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20526) to establish the metric system as the standard for weights and measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: A bill (H. R. 20527) to provide capital for agricultural development, to create a standard form of investment based upon farm mortgages, to equalize rates of interest upon farm loans, to furnish a market for United States bonds, to provide a method of applying postal savings deposits to the promotion of the public welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GARDNER: A bill (H. R. 20528) to authorize the maintenance of organizations of the mobile army at their maxi-

mun strength and to provide an increase of 1,000 officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 20529) to prevent, prohibit, and punish frauds, and cheating and swindling in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 692) authorizing the payment of \$1,200 to William McKinley Cobb for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the third session of the Sixty-third Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANSBERRY: A bill (H. R. 20530) granting a pension to Clarence E. Gleason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20531) granting an increase of pension to William Hilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAILEY: A bill (H. R. 20532) granting a pension to Elizabeth C. Grimes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 20533) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hayward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 20534) granting an increase of pension to James S. Botsford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20535) granting a pension to James M. Thurston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20536) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in case of Albert G. Peabody; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COOPER: A bill (H. R. 20537) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 20538) granting an increase of pension to William H. Courliss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DANFORTH: A bill (H. R. 20539) granting a pension to Mary E. Blood Coffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 20540) granting a pension to Leo A. Kelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20541) granting an increase of pension to Louis C. T. Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 20542) for the relief of Halvor Nilsen; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20543) granting a pension to Nicholas Schiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20544) granting a pension to Elmira Goshen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20545) granting a pension to Virgil T. Gregory; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20546) granting a pension to J. Horace Keeter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20547) granting a pension to Thomas M. Boswell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20548) granting a pension to Charles G. Farling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20549) granting an increase of pension to Arthur Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20550) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Kramer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 20551) for the relief of Rev. D. O. Sanborn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: A bill (H. R. 20552) for the relief of James D. Watts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 20553) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Streets; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AVIS: A bill (H. R. 20554) granting an increase of pension to N. B. Nicholson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STONE: A bill (H. R. 20555) to reimburse James McDowell, postmaster at Armington, Ill., for expense of opening and repairing safe caused by attempted robbery; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: Petitions signed by Rev. Theodore Bunderthal and other citizens of Atchison, Kans., protesting against

shipment of munitions of war to belligerent countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany H. R. 19837, for the relief of Homer C. Dodd; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of William M. Pence, Norfolk, Va., favoring an appropriation for the redemption of the Holy Land in the New World; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring passage of S. 3672, relative to straightening of the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DILLON: Petition of citizens of South Dakota, favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Jay Smith Camp, No. 2, of Mitchell, S. Dak., favoring law to make none but veterans officers of the National Soldiers' Homes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: Petition of citizens of Bridgeport, Conn., against alleged violations of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of citizens of the State of Wisconsin, favoring House joint resolution 377; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of the executive committee of the Interstate Inland Waterway League of Louisiana and Texas, favoring certain amendments to rivers and harbors bill; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GERRY: Petitions of the Louttit Home Hand Laundry Co., What Cheer Laundry, Providence, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for protection against Chinese competition; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. C. Barber, Shannock, R. I., urging the passage of legislation restoring protective tariff to American industries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of Saida S. Wright, Mrs. Draper, Walter A. Wright, of Newport, R. I.; Mary Sturtevant, of Middletown, R. I.; Lorian C. Beckwith, Nettie E. Bauer, of Providence, R. I., urging the passage of legislation providing for equal suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMORE: Memorial of the National Grange at Wilmington, Del., favoring restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the board of directors of the Taunton Chamber of Commerce, favoring the Gardner resolution (H. J. Res. 377); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES: Petitions of Jefferson School Mothers' Club; I. F. B. Lodge, No. 686; Live Oak Lodge, Knights of Pythias; Loyal Order of Moose; Ancient Order of Hibernians; Oakland Circle, Sons of American Revolution; Knights of Pythias; Estrella Da Mantha Council, No. 84, I. D. E. S.; Le Tres Joli Club; Knights and Ladies Council 733, Fraternal Order of Eagles, all of Oakland, Cal., favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of Independent Order of Red Men, Los Santos, Cal.; Knights of Pythias, of Fruitvale, Cal.; Woodmen of America and Independent Order of Red Men, of San Jose, Cal.; Creston Social Club, of Creston, Cal.; and Oakland (Cal.) Lodge of Fraternal Brotherhood, favoring Hamill civil-service retirement bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Walter A. and Saida S. Wright, of Newport, R. I., favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KONOP: Letters and petitions of citizens of ninth congressional district in favor of House joint resolution 377, prohibiting shipment of arms to belligerents of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LAFFERTY: Papers to accompany a bill for relief of James D. Watts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEVY: Memorial of New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring passage of Senate bill 3672, relative to straightening the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MAHAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Rockville, Conn., favoring the passage of a joint resolution prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition from the United States to any of the belligerent nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: Petition of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, favoring the passage of Senate bill 3672, relative to straightening the Harlem River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MURRAY: Memorial of German-American citizens of Oklahoma, favoring Hitchcock bill for neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. J. I. NOLAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Cal., members of Our Own Money League, for a modification of the currency laws of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, resolutions of the fruit growers of California, favoring the passage of House bill 4357; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolutions of Fruitvale Aerie, No. 1375, F. O. E.; Oakland Lodge, No. 324, Loyal Order of Moose; T. F. B. Lodge No. 686; John B. Wyman Circle, No. 22, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic; Oakland Lodge, No. 123, Fraternal Brotherhood; and Jefferson School Mothers' Club, all of Oakland; Wetonka Tribe 208, Improved Order of Red Men, of Los Gatos; Estrella Da Mantha Council, No. 84, I. D. E. S., of Oakland; Fruitvale Lodge, No. 56, Knights of Pythias, of Fruitvale; Knights and Ladies of Security, Oakland Lodge, No. 733, and Le Tres Joli Club, of Oakland; Ouray Tribe 132, Improved Order of Red Men, of San Jose; Dirigo Lodge, No. 224, K. O. P., and Live Oak Lodge, No. 17, Knights of Pythias, of Oakland; and San Jose Camp 7777, Modern Woodmen of America, of San Jose, all in the State of California, representing a total membership of 5,643, favoring the passage of the Hamill bill (H. R. 5139) for civil-service retirement; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petitions of Mrs. Charles Weaver, Mrs. Joseph Howland, and Mrs. Walter N. Hill, Newport; Ruth P. Burgess, Athenwood, Newport; Mary B. L. Steedman, Providence; A. B. Vernon, Abbie Langley, Tallie B. Manchester, Sarah W. Covell, Mary S. Sheffield, Margaret Sheffield, Mary L. Ives, Mary J. Peckham, Laura B. Peckham, Antoinette S. Peckham, Martha H. Stedman, Annie Bryant, Martha A. Coggeshall, Sarah T. Hammett, Elizabeth P. Burdick, Jane B. Coggeshall, Louise D. Hammett, Sarah P. Landers, Isabella Sanborn, Mary C. Sherman, Louise Arnold, Elizabeth Vernon, Mary W. Case, Susan C. Weaver, and Leonora H. Vernon, all of the State of Rhode Island, against woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Mrs. Eugene Sturtevant, Mary Sturtevant, and Louisa C. Sturtevant, Newport; Mary B. Anthony, Mary R. Ballou, Mrs. Carroll Miller, and Ingeborg Kindstedt, Providence; Elizabeth B. Peckham, Margaret Bokee, Charles Biesel, and Mrs. Maud Howe Elliott, Newport; Elizabeth Upham Yates, Providence; Helena Sturtevant, Middletown; Marian E. Jenckes, Providence; Mrs. Sarah M. Ray Aldrich, East Providence; Alice B. Ham, Providence; George W. Eddy and Walter Hayward, Wickford; Mrs. J. W. North and Sara L. G. Fittz, Providence; Mrs. Draper and Mr. Walter A. Wright, Newport; Salda S. Wright, Weaver Cottage, Newport; Mary Sturtevant, Middletown; Carl Borus and Arthur L. Washburn, Providence; Annabel Ledhi Berry, Newport; Ellen M. Anthony, Barton P. Jenks, and Edwin C. Smith, Providence, all in the State of Rhode Island, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: Petition of citizens of New York City relative to violations of neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Petition of Minnesota Peace Society, protesting against any increase in our military or naval program at this time; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of E. C. Miller and 15 other citizens of Lorain, Ohio, favoring the adoption of House joint resolution No. 377 to prohibit the shipment of arms to the warring nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Memorial of Freedom Lodge, No. 139, International Order of Good Templars, of Worcester, Mass., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 15, 1915.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we seek Thee in the altitudes of prayer before we address ourselves to the common tasks of life. We stand upon the common platform with our unity of interest and with our common need before Thee. When we enter the arena of life, and in the great discipline of life that Thou hast committed to us, we must stand in our own individual personality. We pray that we may carry with us into the tasks of this day the impression of Thy Holy Spirit and that we may realize that the oneness of our life is in God. In our effort to bring peace, prosperity, and happiness to the people of a great Nation we shall be successful according to the measure of our interest

in Thy kingdom and of our obedience to Thy will. So do Thou guide us. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

YAKIMA INDIAN RESERVATION (H. DOC. NO. 1472).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a plan for the distribution of water on the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash., and for reimbursing the Government for sums it may have expended or may expend for a complete irrigation system for that reservation, which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed.

INDIANS OF NORTH CAROLINA (S. DOC. NO. 677).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of June 30, 1914, a report of an investigation of the condition and tribal rights of the Indians of Robeson and adjoining counties of North Carolina, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs and ordered to be printed.

SHIPMENT OF NAVAL STORES ABROAD.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have several telegrams with reference to the naval-stores question. One of them, which is short, I should like to have read and the others placed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Georgia will be complied with unless there is objection. The Chair hears none, and the Secretary will read the first telegram sent to the desk.

The telegram was read, as follows:

SAVANNAH, GA., December 29, 1914.

Senator HOKE SMITH,

Washington, D. C.:

Have just wired Secretary of State emphatic protest against action of British Government in declaring rosin and turpentine absolute contraband. You are well aware of the enormous losses already sustained by the Southern States growing out of this European war through the paralysis of the cotton market, and this additional burden now proposed to be put upon our people prompts the inquiry as to what rights neutrals have which belligerents are bound to respect. We emphatically insist that there is no good reason why rosin or turpentine should be made contraband, and that to do so will do more damage to neutrals than to the belligerents against whom it is directed. Whether contraband or not, we also insist that our commerce with neutral ports in these commodities should suffer no interference. Over 60 per cent of these commodities are exported to Europe, a large portion of which goes to North Sea ports. The proposed action will be an additional and heavy burden imposed upon the South, and we request that you co-operate with the State Department to the extent of your abilities in averting this threatened destruction of our commerce in these commodities.

JOHN W. MOTTE,

President Savannah Board of Trade.

The remainder of the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA, GA., December 29, 1914.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Naval stores, lumber, and crossite industries so closely interdependent that if one is hurt all suffer. In Georgia these lines aggregate over thirty millions annually. Please spare no effort to keep turpentine from contraband list.

C. J. HADEN,

President Georgia Chamber of Commerce.

SAVANNAH, GA., December 31, 1914.

HOKE SMITH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Whether turpentine is or is not used in manufacture of new explosive which we understand is called "turbinate" from name of its inventor and not because of its supposed ingredients, we insist that this affords no justification whatever for declaring rosin contraband nor for interfering with trade between neutrals in either turpentine or rosin. Under Lord Salisbury's interpretation of the rule, as we understand it, Great Britain must show not merely that shipment might be used for purposes of war, but that it is actually destined for enemy's military service. We feel confident firm insistence at this time by our State Department on our rights as neutrals will accomplish the result desired and prevent immense losses which our people must otherwise suffer. We bespeak your continued cooperation and earnest support in our efforts to avoid this disaster.

J. W. MOTTE,

President Savannah Board of Trade.

VALDOSTA, GA., December 30, 1914.

Hon. HOKE SMITH,

Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.:

The Valdosta Chamber of Commerce approves protest of United States against English action placing naval stores on contraband list, and urges you to use all possible influences to have these commodities going to neutral ports remain on noncontraband list.

J. M. ASHELY, Secretary.

SHIPMENTS TO NEUTRAL COUNTRIES.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a letter from a manufacturing company in New Hampshire touching upon a public question that is now in the mind of the people of the United States, and I ask that it may be read.